DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 088 608 PS 007 215

AUTHOR Greenblatt, Bernard; Eberhard, Icis
TITLE Children on Campus: A Survey of Pre-Kindergarten Programs at Institutions of Higher Education in the United States.
INSTITUTION State Univ. of New York Research Foundation, Buffalo.; Women's Bureau (DOL), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 73
NOTE 118p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$5.40
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Organization; *College Planning; Day Care Programs; Educational Finance; Laboratory Schools; Nursery Schools; Physical Facilities; *Preschool Programs; *Program Descriptions; School Schedules; *School Surveys

ABSTRACT

In an attempt to collect information about pre-kindergarten programs at institutions of higher learning, a random sample of 310 college and university presidents in the United States were asked to respond to a questionnaire. The purposes of the survey were the following: (1) to estimate how many pre-kindergarten programs are sponsored by colleges and universities within the United States; (2) to describe the operational features of these programs; (3) to identify similarities and differences between 'day care' and other types of pre-kindergarten programs; and (4) to develop an empirically-based typology or classification of pre-kindergarten programs. (The typology is the subject of another report, currently underway). The information should prove useful to students, staff, faculty, and university administrators involved in the development of a campus-based pre-kindergarten program. (CS)

CHILDREN ON CAMPUS

A Survey of Pre-Kindergarten Programs at Institutions of Higher Education in the United States

Women's Bureau
Employment Standards Administration
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

1973

CHILDREN ON CAMPUS

A Survey of Pre-Kindergarten Programs at Institutions of Higher Education in the United States

By:
Bernard Greenblatt and Lois Eberhard
State University of New York at Buffalo

Published by:
Women's Bureau
Employment Standards Administration
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

1973

FOREWORD

Among other developments on campuses in the decade of the 1960's, day care programs seemed to be burgeoning. From both personal experience and reading newspapers, the campus observer could easily gain the impression that such programs were sweeping the campuses.[1] A brief inquiry revealed that reasonably accurate and systematically gathered information to support --or correct--such impressions did not exist. Nor was information available to those planning to develop such programs, or to develop policy for multi-campus systems, on the operational features of such programs as were existent. This situation stimulated undertaking a survey of "day care" in the Spring of 1971.

The survey involved a systematic, random sample of 310 senior, co-educational, accredited colleges and universities in the United States. The sample was selected from the 1,093 such institutions in the Nation in 1970. Data reported on programs in the sample allowed calculating national estimates--estimates pertaining to the almost 1,100 institutions of higher education sampled. Among the key findings are the following:

1. About 425 pre-kindergarten programs may be found on American campuses. Approximately 90 are designated as day care centers, 135 as nursery school programs, 75 as laboratory school programs, and 125 as combination types.

2. One such program may be found on 1 of every 4 campuses (among the 1,100 institutions).

3. The pre-kindergarten programs enroll an average of 40 children. Roughly 17,000 children are enrolled in pre-kindergarten programs on American campuses.

4. Almost 6 out of every 10 programs are enrolled to capacity. Those under-enrolled report, on the average, being able to accommodate another 13 children.

5. A majority of pre-kindergarten programs maintain a waiting list, with an average of 63 children on that list.

6. About 82 percent of the programs charge fees. Those that do, charge on the average $7.55 weekly per child.

Other information presented describes the operations and selected features of the programs and similarities and differences between "day care" and other types of pre-kindergarten programs.

---

1. For a statement on the entrance of the "day care movement" into the campus arena, see Paula Page, "The Campus and the Day Care Movement," Campus Day Care: Issues and Resources (pamphlet published by the Child Welfare League of America, Inc.), 1971, pp. 2-6.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This report represents a collaborative effort. The first-named author carried overall responsibility for development and conduct of the survey, analyzed the data, and prepared the report. The second-named author (then a graduate student getting research experience) participated in all developmental stages of the survey, supervised the numerous mailings, edited and tabulated the data, and reviewed the manuscript.

Acknowledgments are due a number of persons and organizations. Among those at the State University of New York at Buffalo who contributed administrative support or technical guidance and assistance were Lawrence Cappiello, Gail Bruder, and Irving Sigel; also, Joel Rose of the University for his help on sampling and estimating procedures.

Others whom we want to thank are Aftab A. Khan, State University College at Buffalo; Edward Zigler, former Director of the Office of Child Development, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare; Dolly Lynch, also of the Office of Child Development; and Ann W. Shyne, Child Welfare League of America. We appreciate the cooperation of the respondents; of Elizabeth Duncan Koontz, former Director of the Women's Bureau, U.S. Department of Labor; and of Bureau staff members Beatrice Rosenberg and Pearl G. Spindler.

The survey was supported in part by an Institutional Research Grant administered by the Research Foundation of the State University of New York.

CONTENTS

		Page
Foreword		iii
Acknowledgments		iv
I.	Survey Purposes and Scope	1
II.	Survey Procedures, Sample Frame, and Response Rates	4
III.	National Estimates	10
	A. Number of Programs	10
	B. Types of Programs	10
	C. Selected Program Features	13
IV.	The Programs and Their Collegiate Setting	15
	A. Program Initiation	15
	B. Physical Plant	16
	C. Funding Sources	20
	D. Management	23
V.	Campus Effects on Admissions and Program Schedules	29
VI.	Profile of the Programs	35
	A. Size of Programs	37
	B. Program Schedules	40
	C. Finances	43
	D. Staff	48
VII.	Summary and Conclusions	53
Appendixes		
	A. List of Programs	61
	B. Cover Letters	69
	C. Questionnaire	76
	D. Sample Plan, Stratum Weights, and Sampling Variability	83
	E. Appendix Tables	89

List of Text Tables

Because of rounding, percentages may not add to totals. "Average" refers to arithmetic mean.

Table	Title	Page
1	Sample Frame of Survey	6
2	Response Experience From Office of President in Sample Institutions, by Stratum	7
3	Responding Institutions and Pre-K Programs at Those Institutions, by Stratum	8
4	Number of Pre-K Programs Reported at Each Responding Institution, by Stratum	8
5	Response Experience From Pre-K Programs in Sample Institutions, by Stratum	9
6	Type of Pre-K Program as Designated by Respondents, by Stratum	11
7	National Estimates of Pre-K Program Types on Campuses in the United States, 1971	12
8	Primary Initiator of Pre-K Programs, by Stratum	15
9	Primary Initiator of Pre-K Programs, by Type of Program	16
10	Campus Location of Pre-K Programs, by Stratum	17
11	Campus Location of Pre-K Programs, by Type of Program	17
12	Property Status of Pre-K Physical Plants, by Stratum	18
13	Property Status of Pre-K Physical Plants, by Type of Program	19
14	Property Status of Pre-K Physical Plants and Fire/ Liability Coverage of Pre-K Programs Under University/ College Insurance	19

List of Text Tables--Continued

Table	Title	Page
15	Stratum, by University/College Contribution of Operational Funds to Pre-K Programs	20
16	University/College Contribution of Operational Funds, by Type of Pre-K Program	21
17	Type of University/College Resources for Pre-K Programs, by Stratum	22
18	Type of University/College Resources for Pre-K Programs, by Type of Program	22
19	Non-University/College Source of More Than Half of Operational Funds of Pre-K Programs	23
20	Locus of Authority for Administering Pre-K Programs, by Type of Program	24
21	Academic Department Administering Pre-K Programs	25
22	Academic Department Administering Pre-K Programs, by Type of Program	25
23	Academic Departments Using Pre-K Programs for Training, by Type of Program	26
24	Locus of Authority for Hiring Director and/or Head Teacher, by Type of Program	27
25	Locus of Authority for Hiring Pre-K Program Director and/or Head Teacher, by University/College Contribution of Operational Funds	28
26	Criteria for Acceptance to Pre-K Programs, by Type of Program	30
27	Enrollment Limitation to Children of Students, by Type of Program	31
28	Uniformity/Flexibility of Children's Daily Attendance, by Type of Program	32

List of Text Tables--Continued

Table	Title	Page
29	Program Schedule Adapted to Academic Needs of Parents Who Are Students, by Type of Program	32
30	Comparative Frequency of Parents Who Are Students, by Type of Program	34
31	Proportion of Mothers Who Head Families, by Type of Program	34
32	Year Pre-K Programs Were Established, by Type of Program	35
33	Certification of Pre-K Programs, by Type of Program	36
34	Number of Children Enrolled in Pre-K Programs, by Type of Program	37
35	Number of Children Under and Over 3 Years of Age Enrolled in Pre-K Programs, by Type of Program	39
36	Unused Capacity of Pre-K Programs, by Type of Program	39
37	Pre-K Programs With a Waiting List, by Type of Program	40
38	Number of Children on Waiting Lists of Pre-K Programs, by Type of Program	41
39	Daily Duration of Pre-K Programs, by Type of Program	41
40	Type of Pre-K Programs, by Daily Duration	43
41	Length of Pre-K Program Year, by Type of Program	44
42	Average Annual Operating Budget of Pre-K Programs, by Daily and Annual Duration of Program	46

List of Text Tables--Continued

Table	Title	Page
43	Average Annual Per Capita Cost of Pre-K Programs, by Daily and Annual Duration of Program	47
44	Average Annual Per Capita Cost of Pre-K Programs, by Type and Annual Duration of Program	47
45	Average Weekly Fee Paid, by Daily Duration of Pre-K Program	48
46	Average Number of Children Per Adult in Pre-K Programs, by Age Group and Type of Program	51
47	Highest Education Level Achieved by Directors of Pre-K Programs, by Type of Program	52
48	Highest Education Level Achieved by Head Teachers of Pre-K Programs, by Type of Program	52

In the course of developing the goals of this survey, it soon became clear that definitional difficulties would abound. Particularly, how was "day care" to be distinguished from other similar programs, such as a nursery school? A brief examination of widely used--to some extent authoritative--definitions may be instructive. A "day care center" is a facility which

> serves groups of 12 or more children....[by] providing direct care and protection of infants, preschool and school-age children outside of their own homes during a portion of a 24-hour day. (The Office of Economic Opportunity uses 7 hours as the minimum time period for its preschool day care programs....) Comprehensive services include, but are not limited to, educational, social, health, and nutritional services and parent participation.[1]

"Nursery school" is defined as

> a beginning group or class which provides educational experiences, during the year or years preceding kindergarten... under the direction of a qualified teacher.[2]

These definitions obviously lack a clear differentiation between day care and nursery school in terms of ages of the children or the scope of program activities. The terms seriously overlap, rather than being mutually exclusive.

Over a decade ago confusion was recognized "as to the differences between day care and nursery schools, play groups, shopping center babysitting services, bowling alley nurseries, and the like."[3] That confusion still reigns. From the definitions cited above, and others in widely distributed publications,[4] the conclusion seems inescapable that a clear and distinctive terminology has not yet been established.

---

1. Excerpted from Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements, approved by U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity, and U.S. Department of Labor, Sept. 23, 1968, pp. v,5.

2. Lillian L. Gore assisted by Rose E. Koury, A Survey of Early Elementary Education in Public Schools: 1960-1961, U.S. Dept. of HEW, Office of Education (Washington: U.S. GPO, 1965), p. 5.

3. Gertrude L. Hoffman, Day Care Services: Form and Substance, a report of a conference November 17-18, 1960 (Washington: U.S. GPO, 1961), p. 44.

4. See "Day Care: What and Why," Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., 1972, and "Day Nurseries for Preschoolers," Small Business Reporter, Vol. 8, No. 10 (1969).

The terminological confusion led to two survey alternatives. The respondents could be provided a clear and distinctive definition of "day care," devised for purposes of the survey, which would distinguish that type of program from others on campuses. Or, by broadening the survey to cover all types of pre-kindergarten programs, the respondents could designate the type of program they deemed appropriate. In the belief that the former alternative would probably result in greater artificiality and an underestimate of campus "day care" programs, the latter was chosen. The consequence, of course, is a loss of terminological precision; a program entitled "day care" on one campus may be called "nursery school" on another.

This definitional decision altered the survey aims. The purposes of the survey as it was undertaken then were the following:

1. to estimate how many pre-kindergarten programs are sponsored by colleges and universities within the United States;

2. to describe the operations and other features of those programs;

3. to identify similarities and differences between "day care" and other types of pre-kindergarten programs;

4. to develop an empirically based typology or classification of pre-kindergarten programs.

Chapter III of this report provides the data relating to the first purpose. The information in Chapters IV, V, and VI deals with the second and third purposes. The fourth purpose is not addressed in the present report; it is the subject of another report, work on which is currently underway.

Fiscal considerations at the outset limited the study to a mail questionnaire survey. Use of a mail questionnaire further restricted the scope to the more objective questionnaire items (that is, items which can be expressed in relatively unambiguous terms and which are not loaded with contentious professional connotations). So, for example, for the most part this survey does not deal with significant aspects bearing directly upon the content and quality of pre-kindergarten programs.

Also excluded from the survey are controversial topics with social, ideological, and moral implications. The spread and development of day care, Headstart, and other types of pre-kindergarten programs might suggest that they represent an idea whose time has arrived. If so, then the irony must be appreciated that "it" is an idea with widely different meaning to proponents and opponents in regard to appropriate clientele, program content and standards, relevant experts, and social purpose. Even the adherents range widely across the ideological spectrum: labor--concerned with fringe benefits to ease their members' lot, and management--

seeking to reduce absenteeism and employee turnover, thus stabilizing the work force; public administrators and legislators--bent on facilitating employment of mothers on the welfare rolls or on interrupting the cycle of poverty and cultural deprivation; welfare mothers--interested in having their children adequately provided for, especially if work is preferred to welfare; political liberals--who view pre-school programs as a downward extension of the education system; political conservatives--concerned with reducing the welfare tax burden by maternal employment; various political activists and radicals (women's liberation--advocating emancipation from kitchen and nursery; blacks--seeking to foster growth of a positive self-conception; various leftist groups--aiming at developing non-competitive, cooperative individuals attuned to other life styles in a capitalist society); educators and child development specialists--convinced their expertise should supplement, perhaps supplant, the uninformed parental amateur; parents--seeking to control their child's ideas and ideals by establishing congenial programs; and student-, staff-, and faculty-parents simply struggling to juggle numerous roles and responsibilities.[5] These conflicting views and cross-purposes are barely touched upon in the survey. It is also silent on such significant issues as the effects of the programs on the family as an institution or on the development of children.

Tempting as it was when the survey was undertaken, and as it now remains, to address these more substantial and significant questions, the present survey had a more modest aim. It simply sought information not otherwise available and important as such; the information sought concerns programs which, if one can make a prognostication, are likely to be more significant rather than less so in the future. The information gathered may also be useful to students, staff, faculty, and university administrators as they face the desire or pressure to develop a campus-based pre-kindergarten program. Finally, the data may also be of interest to Federal officials concerned with women, children, and pre-primary program planning.

---

5. For one expression of some of these ideological implications, see Page, op. cit.; for bibliographic references to others, see Karen Kollias, "Day Care and Early Education: An Annotated Bibliography," also in Campus Day Care, op. cit.

CHAPTER II - SURVEY PROCEDURES, SAMPLE FRAME, AND RESPONSE RATES

The pertinent survey procedures concern definition of key terms and the process of program identification. As was mentioned earlier, one of the most problematic issues dealt with concerned the definition of program types. This affected the conception of the survey itself. During the operational phases of the survey, it was entitled A Survey of Child Care at Institutions of Higher Education. The phrase "child care" was intended to cover the multiplicity of various program types and to avoid identification of the survey with one or another specific program category. It was also adopted with the aim of avoiding professionally or socially invidious considerations. (Interesting subtleties of professional terminology came to be appreciated in the course of conducting the survey. One well-known program, which has for decades trained early childhood educators, responded that the questionnaire did not pertain to their program, which provided not mere "child care" but education and child development. The likelihood that educators would interpret the phrase "child care" as referring to the menial tasks associated with raising children had been earlier offered as a piece of consultative advice.)

The change of the earlier title to the focus on "pre-kindergarten programs" reflected the above survey experiences as well as subsequent recognition of the need to exclude kindergarten programs from the survey. (Several campuses responding in the survey indicated that among other types of "child care" programs being conducted were kindergarten programs.) In summary, then, the survey focused upon pre-kindergarten programs of a diverse range but limited to the under-kindergarten age groups.

So far as the various types of pre-kindergarten programs were a definitional concern, the survey recognized the unavailability of a widely accepted classification or typology of such programs. Therefore, the respondents were simply asked to designate the type of program they operated. In short, the program types presented in this report are self-designated. Those designations more likely reflect preferences than objective description or analysis.

Another key term which had to be precisely defined was "institution of higher education." It was decided to limit that term to senior, co-educational, accredited colleges and universities. The decision to exclude junior colleges and all-male or all-female institutions was based on assumptions of much lower prevalence of pre-kindergarten programs at such institutions. Colleges and universities which were not accredited (as of 1970) were excluded for practical reasons. The survey also focused upon currently operating programs; that is, the respondents were to complete the questionnaire if their program was in operation at

the time the questionnaire reached them (during the Spring of 1971). Programs which were being planned to start in operation were not considered appropriate for inclusion.

Once the definitions were settled upon, it was then necessary to obtain a list of programs which fit those terms. An up-to-date directory of child care or pre-kindergarten programs at institutions of higher education did not exist, so it was necessary to develop such a list for purposes of the survey. A two-stage process of identification was used. The first stage involved an inquiry to the presidents of institutions in the sample selected, asking for identification of programs on their respective campuses which would be appropriate to the study. The second stage involved mailing the questionnaire to the program directors identified by the office of the president at the sample institutions.[1]

The original letter of inquiry was mailed to the president of each institution of higher education included in the sample (see Appendix B, Number 1). If there was no response from that office within the designated time, then a first followup letter, and if necessary a second, was sent (see Appendix B, Number 2 and Number 3). (The original letters were sent by surface mail to sample institutions within 300 miles of Buffalo and by airmail to those outside that range; postpaid, self-addressed return envelopes were provided. The first followup letter to an office of the president was sent as certified mail and the second by airmail special delivery.)

As responses were received identifying the pre-kindergarten programs and providing the names of the program directors, a cover letter and questionnaire were mailed to those individuals (see Appendix B, Number 4 and Appendix C, respectively). Subsequently, two followup letters (see Appendix B, Number 5 and Number 6) were sent to those program directors not responding to the previous request. The final systematic attempt to elicit responses was a night letter (see Appendix B, Number 7) which was sent approximately six weeks after the initial request to the program directors. (Prior to the use of night letters, a range of mail classes was employed, analogous to the pattern employed to obtain responses from the office of the president. The original questionnaire and letter to program directors were sent by surface mail to places within a 300-mile radius of Buffalo, and by airmail to those programs outside that range; postpaid, self-addressed return envelopes were also provided. The first followup went via airmail special delivery; the second followup went via airmail, certified mail; and the night letter was the third followup. Finally, phone calls were received from or made to several program

1. This procedure was adopted from Aftab A. Kahn, "Child Development Centers at Institutions of Higher Learning," (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Maryland, 1967).

directors as indicated by special circumstances.)

The two-stage identification process and the questionnaire itself were pre-tested by sending the pertinent materials to junior colleges with known pre-kindergarten programs in operation and also to several institutions which were randomly chosen from the same source as the final sample but which had not been selected for that sample. Prior to this, several knowledgeable persons in the field of child care, early childhood education, or child development were asked to review the questionnaire and make suggestions or recommendations. These are also selectively reflected in the final draft of the questionnaire.

The sample frame of the survey is highlighted in Table 1.

Table 1.--Sample Frame of Survey

Stratum	Universe of institutions[1]	Sample of institutions[2]	Sample fractions-institutions
Total	1,093	310	
Small universities and colleges[3]	655	163	1/4
Large universities and colleges[3]	438	147	1/3

1/ Source: Senior, co-educational, accredited colleges and universities, listed in Information Please Almanac, 1971, pp. 700-719.

2/ Stratified sample (approximation to optimum allocation). See Appendix D.

3/ Small universities and colleges are those listed in the above source with enrollments of less than 2,500; large are those with enrollments of 2,500 and over.

From the table it may be seen that a total of 310 institutions of higher education constituted the sample for this survey. (For the rationale and procedures employed in developing the stratified sample, see Appendix D.) The original letter of inquiry, mentioned above, was sent to the office of the president in the 310 institutions in the sample.

The responses from the office of the president are summarized

in Table 2. Responses were received from all but eight of the 310 colleges and universities. Of the 302 institutions responding to the inquiry, 100 institutions reported one or more pre-kindergarten programs, of one or another type, in operation on their campuses. As had been originally hypothesized, the likelihood of a pre-kindergarten program on a campus was much greater among the large universities and colleges than among the small institutions. Seventy-six programs were identified on large campuses and 24 on small campuses.

Table 2.--Response Experience From Office of President in Sample Institutions, by Stratum

Response experience	Total	Stratum: Small universities and colleges 1/	Stratum: Large universities and colleges 2/
All institutions	310	163	147
No response	8	4	4
Reported eligible programs 3/	100	24	76
Reported no eligible program	202	135	67

1/ Hereafter called "small."
2/ Hereafter called "large."
3/ Includes several programs within one institution.

The first phase of the identification and data collection process dealt with institutions as the unit of interest. The result of the first phase was the identification of institutions (in the sample) with pre-kindergarten programs. Then the unit of interest shifts to the programs themselves. The two-stage process is somewhat complicated in that the unit of measurement shifts from institutions in the first phase to programs in the second. The data pertaining to the units of measurement are presented in Tables 3 and 4. Another complication is that not all the directors of the programs identified by the office of the president at the sample colleges or universities responded to the questionnaire. Still a further complication is introduced by the presence on some campuses of more than one pre-kindergarten program. The highlights of the data on this somewhat complex issue are these: the 100 responding institutions reported a total of 134 pre-kindergarten programs. As may be seen in

Table 3.--Responding Institutions and Pre-K Programs at Those Institutions, by Stratum

Responding institutions	Total	Stratum	
		Small	Large
All institutions	100	24	76
With reported pre-K programs responding	95	23 1/	72 2/
With reported pre-K programs not responding	5	1	4 3/
Reported programs	134	27	107 4/

1/ Includes 20 institutions with 1 program and 3 institutions with 2 programs reported in each.
2/ Includes 55 institutions with 1 program, 14 institutions with 2 programs, and 3 institutions with 3 programs reported in each.
3/ The 4 institutions had a total of 9 programs.
4/ Includes 6 programs which did not respond, although other programs at their institutions did.

Table 4.--Number of Pre-K Programs Reported at Each Responding Institution, by Stratum

Number of pre-K programs at institution	Total	Stratum	
		Small	Large
	310	163	147
0	210 1/	139	71
1	72 2/	21	51
2	23 2/	3	20
3	4 2/	--	4
4	1 2/	--	1

1/ Institutions without a response from the office of the president are assumed to be without a pre-kindergarten program.
2/ Includes institutions reporting all eligible programs (both those responding and those not responding to the questionnaire).

Table 5, 118 respondents from these programs responded to the survey by completing the questionnaire. The completed questionnaires are the main source of the information presented in this report.

Table 5.--Response Experience from Pre-K Programs in Sample Institutions, by Stratum

Pre-K programs	Total	Stratum	
		Small	Large
All	134	27	107
Did not respond	16	1	15
Did respond	118	26	92
Response rate (percent responding)	(88.1)	(96.3)	(85.9)

The response experience from the second phase of the survey indicates that questionnaires were received from 96.3 percent of the identified programs in the small stratum compared with 85.9 percent of the programs in the large stratum. Overall the response rate for the second phase is 88 percent; that is, completed questionnaires were obtained from 88 percent of the 134 programs identified by the office of the president of the sample colleges and universities.

CHAPTER III - NATIONAL ESTIMATES

This chapter presents various national estimates computed from data from the probability sample used in the survey. That is, from the sample values obtained, estimates were calculated which apply to the population of approximately 1,100 senior, co-educational, accredited colleges and universities in the United States in 1970.

A. Number of Programs

Based on the reports from the president's office in the colleges and universities sampled, it is estimated that approximately 425 pre-kindergarten programs of all types are operating on American campuses.[1]

So far as the survey data may be indicative of the national picture, many campuses have more than one program. (See Table 4) Accordingly, the number of institutions of higher education in the Nation with a pre-kindergarten program is considerably smaller than 425. A simple calculation from the survey data suggests, as a rough estimate, there is at least one pre-kindergarten program in approximately 1 out of 4 of the 1,100 institutions of higher education.

It should be stressed that the estimate of 425 programs on college and university campuses is a sample-based projection. As such it is subject to sampling error. (See Appendix D for the technical discussion of the weighting procedures used for calculating the national estimates and the sampling errors associated with those estimates.) Using the sampling errors calculated permits computation of the range within which would fall the "true" number of pre-kindergarten programs on the campuses (that is, the number one would obtain if all 1,100 institutions had participated in the survey). That range is between 366 and 488. The chances are 19 out of 20 that the number of pre-kindergarten programs on United States campuses would fall within that range.

B. Types of Programs

Estimating the number of programs of the various types on the campuses was one of the survey objectives. The sample percentages in each stratum and the weighted total (national) percentages are presented

---

1. That estimate was prepared from the data presented in Tables 1, 2, 3, and 4. Specifically, the number of programs reported in each stratum (107 in the "large" institutions, 27 in the "small") was multiplied by the inverse of the sample fractions (438/147 and 655/163, respectively). The sum of those multiplications is 427, but has been rounded to 425 (except for purposes of subsequent calculation). This estimate was calculated on a slightly conservative basis--it assumes no programs exist in the eight institutions whose presidents did not respond in the survey.

in Table 6. Overall--disregarding campus size--approximately 1 out of 5 (21.3 percent) of campus pre-kindergarten programs is a day care program, 3 out of 10 (32.1 percent) are nursery school programs, 1 out of 6 (17.6 percent) is a laboratory school program, and almost 3 out of 10 (28.9 percent) are combinations of the other types.

Table 6.--Type of Pre-K Program as Designated by Respondents, by Stratum (in Percent and Number)

Type	Total*	Stratum	
		Small	Large
All types	(100.0%) 118	(100.0%) 26	(100.0%) 92
Day care	(21.3) 27	(19.2) 5	(23.9) 22
Nursery school	(32.1) 39	(30.8) 8	(33.7) 31
Lab school	(17.6) 26	(11.5) 3	(25.0) 23
Other**	(28.9) 26	(38.5) 10	(17.4) 16

* Total percentages are weighted to reflect the respective stratum sizes and percentages. See Appendix D.
** Combinations and indeterminate types.

Important differences may be noted between the large and small campuses. Relatively similar percentages of day care programs are found on large and small campuses (23.9 and 19.2, respectively); that similarity is also displayed by nursery school programs (33.7 and 30.8 percent, respectively). Laboratory school programs, however, are proportionately more than twice as likely to be found at large as at small academic institutions (25.0 and 11.5 percent, respectively); but combination-type programs are two times more likely at small than at large campuses.

The percentage of program types, the estimated number of each type,

and the 95 percent confidence ranges for the national estimates are presented in Table 7. As may be seen from that table, there are approximately 90 day care centers, 135 nursery schools, 75 laboratory schools, and 125 "other" types of programs (reported mostly as combinations of the three program types) on the Nation's campuses. Presumably, some of the 125 "other" programs might be classifiable into one of the three specific program types; the estimates of the three types, therefore, are probably underestimates.

Table 7.--National Estimates of Pre-K Program Types on Campuses in the United States, 1971

Program type	Estimated % in U.S.	Estimated No. in U.S.*	95% confidence range
Total**	100.0	425	366-488
Day care	21.3	90	49-133
Nursery school	32.1	135	88-186
Laboratory school	17.6	75	39-111
Other	28.9	125	74-173

*Rounded to nearest interval of 5.
**The formula and procedures for estimating the total number of programs differ from those for estimating the percentages of program types (see Appendix D). Therefore, the confidence ranges for the program types do not add to the range for the total.

The confidence range has the same meaning as indicated earlier--the chances are 95 out of 100 that each range encompasses the respective national value; that is, that the number of day care centers on the 1,100 campuses is between 49 and 133.[2]

2. In the absence of other current data to corroborate the estimates obtained from this survey, their accuracy must rest upon the survey and estimating procedures employed. In addition, one partial comparison is provided by an enumeration made in 1951. For that year Moustakas and Berson reported a total of 224 nursery school programs (which included laboratory schools) under university auspices (see Appendix Table 1). The comparable figure two decades later--from this survey--is 210 (with a confidence range between 127 and 297). However, as the data in Table 32 (presented later) suggest, many campus nursery and laboratory school programs were developed after 1951; an undetermined number of those enumerated that year probably were no longer operating in 1971.

C. Selected Program Features

National estimates were also prepared for several program features of general interest: number of children enrolled, under-enrollment, number on waiting lists, weekly fees charged, and annual per child cost of operating the programs.

Based on the survey data, pre-kindergarten programs on the 1,100 campuses have an estimated (mean) average enrollment of 40 children.[3] The chances are 95 out of 100 that the "true" average number of children enrolled in pre-kindergarten programs on the campuses lies between 32 and 48.

Almost 6 out of 10 (57 percent) of the programs on campuses are estimated as enrolled at capacity. Among the other 43 percent estimated as not enrolled to capacity, the median number of additional children that could be accommodated is 13.

With a majority of the campus pre-kindergarten programs reported as not being able to accommodate additional children, maintenance of waiting lists could be expected. Data presented later indicate a majority of all types of programs do have waiting lists. (See Table 32) The average number of children on such lists is 63, 1½ times more than the average number enrolled (40). The odds are 95 to 5 that the average number on waiting lists (maintained and counted by an estimated 67 percent of campus programs in the United States) lies between 40 and 85.[4]

An estimated 82 percent of programs on the Nation's campuses charge fees. On the average, a weekly fee of $7.55 is paid. The chances are 95 out of 100 that the average fee collected by fee-charging programs on campuses is between $5.60 and $9.45 a week.

Budgetary data, such as annual per capita operating cost, may

3. Average enrollment is not identical to average "class" size. See Chapter VI.

4. It may be noted that a larger proportion of programs maintained waiting lists of specified counts (67 percent--which excludes a small number not reporting the size of their waiting list) than the proportion estimated at capacity enrollment (57 percent). This may be due to reporting inconsistencies, to program anomalies (such as having children on a waiting list although enrollment is under capacity, or time lags between selecting children from the list to fill available slots), or to sampling variability.

be the least accurate category of information obtained by the survey.[5] Caution is, therefore, advised in employing the estimate of annual per capita cost of program operations. (To avoid a false semblance of precision, these estimates are rounded to the nearest $5.) The average annual cost of operations per child is $635; the 95 percent confidence range for that estimate is from $415 to $850.

5. Two specific grounds exist for this doubt. First, the highest non-response to questionnaire items involved this category; for example, only 56 percent of the respondents provided data on annual per capita cost of operating their programs. Second, the exceedingly wide range and variability of budgetary costs reported suggest eccentricities in those responses; for example, the annual per capita costs of program operations ranged from $4 to $2,800.

   Additional budgetary data are presented, and general accountancy difficulties in such programs are touched on, in Chapter VI.

A. Program Initiation

The categories of persons primarily responsible for initiating the pre-kindergarten programs vary considerably between the small and the large institutions of higher education. Variation also occurs between different program types. From Table 8, it may be seen that faculty members are the most frequent program initiators (44 percent), followed by university administrators (25 percent); combined they are the prime program initiators on over two-thirds of the campuses. (On the small campuses the faculty and administrators have initiated programs in slightly higher proportions than is the case on the larger campuses.) Furthermore, it is evident that overall about 1 out of 9 programs (11.6 percent) is initiated by student-parents. (These are the college or university students whose children are enrolled in the pre-kindergarten programs.) Initiation by student-parents is about five times more likely to occur on the large campuses, however, than on the small campuses.

Table 8.--Primary Initiator of Pre-K Programs, by Stratum (in Percent)

Primary initiator	Total*	Stratum	
		Small	Large
All reporting	100.0% (n=117)	100.0% (n=26)	100.0% (n=91)
Univ./college administrators	25.2	26.9	23.1
Student-parents	11.6	3.8	20.9
Faculty	43.7	46.2	40.7
Students & faculty	3.6	3.8	3.3
Students, faculty, & administrators	1.5	---	3.3
Faculty & administrators	5.2	7.7	2.2
Other	9.3	11.5	6.6

*Total percentages are weighted to reflect stratum sizes and percentages. See Appendix D.

When examining initiation of the different types of programs, it is clear that laboratory programs are almost exclusively initiated by the

faculty and academic administrators (54 and 42 percent, respectively, of such programs), and that the faculty and administrators take the initiative in developing 53 percent and 26 percent, respectively, of campus nursery school programs. (See Table 9) The initiation of day care programs presents a very different picture: 52 percent of such programs are initiated by student-parents, while only 15 percent reflect the initiative of faculty. That student-parents were more active in instigating the development of day care programs on campuses was expected on the basis of experience at Buffalo and of press reports. (Not infrequently, day care is one of the demands of the student "cultural revolution.") As will be seen on other matters, however, anticipated differences between day care and other program types are not borne out by the data.

Table 9.--Primary Initiator of Pre-K Programs, by Type of Program (in Percent)

Primary initiator	Type			
	Day care	Nursery school	Lab school	Other
All responding	100.0% (n=27)	100.0% (n=38)	100.0% (n=26)	100.0% (n=26)
Univ./college adminstrators	7.4	26.3	42.3	15.4
Student-parents	51.9	10.5	---	3.8
Faculty	14.8	52.6	53.8	42.3
Students & faculty	11.1	---	---	7.7
Students, faculty, & administrators	11.1	---	---	---
Faculty & administrators	---	2.6	3.8	7.7
Other	3.7	7.9	---	23.1

B. Physical Plant

Ninety-one percent of the pre-kindergarten programs are located on the campuses. (See Table 10) There are only small differences in this regard between the pre-kindergarten programs sponsored by the small institutions (92.3 percent) and those under the auspices of the larger institutions (88.9 percent). Somewhat larger differences appear upon examining the location of the pre-kindergarten programs in relation to the program type they represent. (See Table 11) All of the laboratory

Table 10.--Campus Location of Pre-K Programs, by Stratum (in Percent)

Campus location	Total*	Stratum	
		Small	Large
All reporting	100.0% (n=116**)	100.0% (n=26)	100.0% (n=90)
On campus	90.8	92.3	88.9
Off campus	9.2	7.7	11.1

*Total percentages are weighted to reflect stratum sizes and percentages. See Appendix D.
**Excludes 2 programs with facilities both on and off campus.

Table 11.--Campus Location of Pre-K Programs, by Type of Program (in Percent)

Campus location	Total	Type			
		Day care	Nursery school	Lab school	Other
All reporting	100.0% (n=116)	100.0% (n=26)	100.0% (n=39)	100.0% (n=26)	100.0% (n=25)
On campus	91.4	80.0	97.4	100.0	84.0
Off campus	8.6	19.2	2.6	---	16.0

school programs and almost all (97.4 percent) of the nursery school programs are located on campuses. However, approximately 1 out of 5 day care programs under the auspices of a college or university is located off campus.

The physical plant which houses the pre-kindergarten program is owned by the university or college in 9 out of 10 situations. (See Table 12) Only small differences are reported between small and large

Table 12.--Property Status of Pre-K Physical Plants, by Stratum (in Percent).

Property status	Total*	Stratum	
		Small	Large
All reporting	100.0% (n=117**)	100.0% (n=26)	100.0% (n=91**)
Owned by university/college	91.3	92.3	90.1
Rented by university/college	2.5	---	5.5
Owned or rented by other institutions	5.2	7.7	2.2
Owned or rented by student-parents	1.0	---	2.2

*Total percentages are weighted to reflect stratum sizes and percentages. See Appendix D.
**Excludes 1 program with both owned and rented physical plant.

institutions in this regard. Ownership of the physical plant varies somewhat more in relation to the type of pre-kindergarten program. (See Table 13) All of the laboratory school and almost all (97.4 percent) of the nursery school buildings are owned by the university or college. However, only three-fourths (78 percent) of the buildings used for campus day care programs are owned by the institutions; another 11 percent of day care facilities are rented by the college or university. Student-parents bear responsibility for (renting or owning) the physical plant of 4 percent of campus day care programs (and also of 4 percent of the "other" type of programs).

University or college ownership of the physical plant does not necessarily carry with it the anticipated insurance consequences. As may be seen from the data in Table 14, almost one-third (31) of the pre-kindergarten programs in physical plants which are owned by the institution of higher education do not carry fire or liability insurance through the university or college. The few (7) remaining programs lacking fire or liability insurance carried by the institutions occupied either rented facilities or facilities owned by other institutions or individuals.

Table 13.--Property Status of Pre-K Physical Plants, by Type of Program (in Percent)

Property status	Total	Type			
		Day care	Nursery school	Lab school	Other
All reporting	100.0% (n=117*)	100.0% (n=27)	100.0% (n=39)	100.0% (n=26)	100.0% (n=25)
Owned by univ./college	90.6	77.7	97.4	100.0	84.0
Rented by univ./college	4.3	11.1	2.6	---	4.0
Owned or rented by other institution	3.4	7.4	---	---	8.0
Owned or rented by student-parents	1.7	3.8	---	---	4.0

*Excludes 1 program with both owned and rented physical plant.

Table 14.--Property Status of Pre-K Physical Plants and Fire/Liability Coverage of Pre-K Programs Under University/College Insurance

Property status	Total	Fire/liability insurance of pre-K program carried by university/college	
		Yes	No
All reporting	111	73	38
Owned by univ./college	100	69	31
Rented by univ./college	5	4	1
Owned or rented by other institutions	4	--	4
Owned or rented by student-parents	2	--	2

C. Funding Sources

The extent to which institutions of higher education contribute operating funds for the pre-kindergarten programs, particularly for day care programs, is an issue of wide interest. It may be seen in Table 15 that the small and large institutions contribute the majority of operating funds to almost 6 out of 10 pre-kindergarten programs on their campuses (56.0 and 59.8 percent, respectively). The universities and colleges provide a majority of operating fund support to about 3 out of 4 laboratory schools or nursery schools on their campuses, but such a level of support is provided to only 1 out of 4 of the campus day care programs. (See Table 16) The vast majority of campus day care programs (3 out of 4) are therefore dependent on non-university sources for the majority of their operating funds.

Table 15.--Stratum, by University/College Contribution of Operational Funds to Pre-K Programs (in Percent)

Stratum	Total	Univ./college contributes more than half of operational funds	
		Yes	No
All reporting*	100.0% (n=117)	57.7 (n=69)	42.3 (n=48)
Small	100.0% (n=25)	56.0	44.0
Large	100.0% (n=92)	59.8	40.2

*Percentages are weighted to reflect stratum sizes and percentages. See Appendix D.

Table 16.--University/College Contribution of Operational Funds, by Type of Pre-K Program (in Percent)

Univ./college contributes more than half of operational funds	Type			
	Day care	Nursery school	Lab school	Other
All reporting	100.0% (n=27)	100.0% (n=39)	100.0% (n=26)	100.0% (n=25)
Yes	25.9	74.4	73.1	56.0
No	74.1	25.6	26.9	44.0

For almost 4 out of 10 programs the dominant form of university resources provided is in kind (space, salaries of faculty and staff, etc.). (See Table 17) In addition to these in-kind payments, about 1 out of 6 pre-kindergarten programs receives university contributions in a combination of cash and kind. In sum, therefore, over half of the pre-kindergarten programs on small and on large campuses receive aid from their academic sponsors in the form of contributions in cash and kind. However, the use of in-kind contributions by colleges and universities for pre-kindergarten programs varies greatly for the different types of programs. Roughly one-half of the laboratory schools and nursery schools receive university contributions which are mainly in kind (48 and 56 percent, respectively). (See Table 18) In contrast, only 15 percent of the day care programs receive institutional contributions in kind.

Data presented earlier (see Table 15) indicate that 42 percent of the pre-kindergarten programs obtain more than one-half of their operating funds from sources other than the university or college. What are the major non-university/college sources? As shown in Table 19, fees are reported to constitute the major "extramural" source of operating funds by 51 percent of those pre-kindergarten programs which are not largely supported by the educational institutions. Public funds from all governmental levels serve as the next largest source (22 percent) of non-univer-

Table 17.--Type of University/College Resources for Pre-K Programs, by Stratum (in Percent)

Type of resources	Total*	Stratum	
		Small	Large
All responding	100.0% (n=107**)	100.0% (n=25)	100.0% (n=82)
Univ./college contrib. in kind	39.0	40.0	37.8
Univ./college contrib. in cash and kind	16.0	16.0	15.9
Univ./college contrib. in kind, plus coop. services	12.1	12.0	12.2
Univ./college contrib. in kind, plus coop. services and gifts	9.3	12.0	6.1
Other combinations	23.6	20.0	28.0

*Total percentages are weighted to reflect stratum sizes and percentages. See Appendix D.
**Excludes 3 respondents reporting fees as only resources, and excludes 8 not reporting this item.

Table 18.--Type of University/College Resources for Pre-K Programs, by Type of Program (in Percent)

Type of resources	Type			
	Day care	Nursery school	Lab school	Other
All reporting	100.0% (n=27)	100.0% (n=34)	100.0% (n=23)	100.0% (n=23)
Univ./college contrib. in kind	14.8	55.9	47.8	26.1
Univ./college contrib. in cash and kind	11.1	14.7	13.0	26.1
Univ./college contrib. in kind, plus coop. services	14.8	5.9	13.0	17.4
Univ./college contrib. in kind, plus coop. services and gifts	11.1	8.8	---	8.7
Other combinations	48.1	14.7	26.1	21.7

Table 19.--Non-University/College Source of More Than Half of Operational Funds of Pre-K Programs (in Percent)

Source	Percent
All reporting	100.0% (n=51*)
Government	21.5
Federal	13.7
State	3.9
Local	3.9
Fees	51.0
Student body	13.7
Fund raising, gifts	9.8
Foundation, church	3.9

*Reported for 46 of the 48 programs which obtain more than half of their operational funds from sources other than the university or college; 2 of the 48 did not specify the non-university/college source; and some respondents report several non-university/college sources.

sity funds.[1] Allocations from student associations constitute the third most important non-university source of operating funds; in fact, the student body was mentioned as a major source of operating funds as frequently as was the Federal Government (14 percent).

D. Management

Academic departments serve as the locus of administrative authority for all of the laboratory schools and for about 9 out of 10 nursery schools but for only 1 out of 4 day care programs on campuses. (See Table 20) (Academic administrators apparently remain uninvolved from generally administering the pre-kindergarten programs, except for a small proportion of the "other" program type.) Student-parents

1. Data were not obtained on the specific governmental programs and authorizations providing the support. So far as Federal funding is concerned, it would seem plausible that research and training grants are largely involved in pre-kindergarten programs generally as they are in funding "child development centers." See Kahn, op. cit., pp. 148-149.

reportedly wield administrative authority in almost half (48 percent) of the campus day care programs. They do not seem to have significant administrative authority in other campus pre-kindergarten programs.

Table 20.--Locus of Authority for Administering Pre-K Programs, by Type of Program (in Percent)

Locus of administering authority	Type			
	Day care	Nursery school	Lab school	Other
All reporting	100.0% (n=27)	100.0% (n=39)	100.0% (n=26)	100.0% (n=26)
Administration	---	---	---	11.5
Academic departments	25.9	87.2	100.0	76.9
Student-parents	48.1	2.6	---	3.8
Other	25.9	10.3	---	7.7

The academic departments carrying administrative responsibility for pre-kindergarten programs are listed in Table 21. Forty percent of the administering units are home economics departments, less than one-third (28 percent) are education departments, and almost one-fifth (18 percent) are child development departments. Almost two-thirds of the nursery school programs administered by academic units are the responsibility of home economics departments. (See Table 22) Academically administered laboratory schools are more likely responsible to child development and education departments than to the home economics departments. No discernible pattern is displayed by the one-fourth of the campus day care programs administered by academic units.

Notable differences are displayed by the academic departments involved with pre-kindergarten programs for the educational or research training of their college students. (See Table 23) For these purposes, home economics departments reportedly make minimal use of the pre-kindergarten programs. Education departments predominate, followed closely by child development departments and then by psychology departments. Social welfare schools and departments training health professionals, which have almost no administrative responsibility for campus pre-kindergarten programs, each account for not more than 10 percent of the academic departments using these programs for training their college students.

Table 21.--Academic Department Administering Pre-K Programs (in Percent)

Academic department	Percent
Total	100.0 (n=88)
Child development	18.2
Education	28.4
Home economics	39.8
Social welfare	1.1
Other	12.5

Table 22.--Academic Department Administering Pre-K Programs, by Type of Program

Academic department	Total	Type			
		Day care	Nursery school	Lab school	Other
Child development	16	--	1	9	6
Education	25	2	7	8	8
Home economics	35	2	22	5	6
Social welfare	1	1	--	--	--
Other	11	2	5	4	--

Table 23.--Academic Departments Using Pre-K Programs for Training, by Type of Program (in Percent)

Academic department	Type			
	Day care	Nursery school	Lab school	Other
All reporting*	100.0% (n=33)	100.0% (n=106)	100.0% (n=89)	100.0% (n=74)
Child development	30.3	29.2	24.7	25.7
Education	36.4	31.1	24.7	29.7
Health sciences	3.0	8.5	10.1	8.1
Home economics	--	3.8	2.2	4.1
Psychology	21.2	17.9	19.1	18.9
Social welfare	6.1	7.5	9.0	9.5
Other	3.0	1.9	10.1	4.1

*Some respondents report use by several departments.

Shifting attention to differences among the various types of programs used for academic training reveals slight but unexpected differences. Day care programs are used to train social welfare and health science students slightly less often than are alternative types of pre-kindergarten programs. On the other hand, compared with laboratory and nursery schools, day care programs appear slightly more academically advantageous to--or taken advantage of by--education, child development, and psychology departments.

Authority for hiring the principal staff (director or head teacher) contrasts considerably with the locus of administrative authority for the pre-kindergarten programs. (See Tables 20 and 24) The administration of the university or college retains hiring authority in almost half (46 percent) of the nursery school and laboratory school programs, programs for which they do not hold managerial authority. In the other half of the nursery school and laboratory school programs, hiring authority is vested in the academic departments (presumably those with general administrative responsibility for the programs). Authority for hiring key program staff for day care programs also differs from the authority for administering those programs. Student-parents, who are responsible for administering 48 percent of the day care programs, possess hiring

authority in about 30 percent of the programs; university administrators and faculty combined hold authority for hiring principal day care program staff in identical proportions to the student-parents.

Table 24.--Locus of Authority for Hiring Director and/or Head Teacher, by Type of Program (in Percent)

Locus of hiring authority	Type			
	Day care	Nursery school	Lab school	Other
All reporting	100.0% (n=27)	100.0% (n=39)	100.0% (n=26)	100.0% (n=26)
Administration	14.8	46.2	46.2	53.8
Academic departments	14.8	48.7	50.0	26.9
Student-parents	29.6	---	---	11.5
Other	40.7	5.1	3.8	7.7

It may be suspected that the preceding differences--between the loci of managerial authority and the loci of hiring authority--reflect the piper calling the tune. The data in Table 25 lend some support to that suspicion. On 94 percent of the campuses on which the university or college provides the majority of operating funds for the pre-kindergarten programs, the academic administration or the faculty holds the authority to hire the main program staff. This compares with 52 percent of programs not dependent on the academic institution for most of their operating funds. (These programs presumably receive sufficient university support to explain the exercise of institutional hiring authority; on the other hand, perhaps institutional sponsorship suffices.) Moreover, in 20.8 percent of the programs which do not receive a majority of operating funds from the institution, student-parents make the hiring decisions, compared with 1.4 percent of the programs dependent on the institutions of higher education for the majority of their operating funds.

Table 25.--Locus of Authority for Hiring Pre-K Program Director and/or Head Teacher, by University/College Contribution of Operational Funds (in Percent)

Locus of hiring authority	Total	Univ./college contributes more than half of operational funds	
		Yes	No
All reporting	100.0% (n=117)	100.0 (n=69)	100.0 (n=48)
Administration	40.2	52.2	22.9
Academic departments	36.8	42.0	29.2
Student-parents	9.4	1.4	20.8
Other	13.7	4.3	27.1

CHAPTER V - CAMPUS EFFECTS ON ADMISSIONS AND PROGRAM SCHEDULES

This section of the report focuses upon the extent to which eligibility for the pre-kindergarten programs on campus and the program schedules reflect the student status and roles of the parents. Stated differently, it deals with the extent to which those program variables are related to the institutional setting. In addition, some data are reported on family characteristics.

The respondents were asked whether the children were admitted on a first-come-first-served basis. Overall, 45 percent said that was the basis for admission. (See Appendix Table 2) This means, of course, that admission to a majority (55 percent) of the programs is based on other criteria. Admission on the basis of first-come-first-served, that is, on the basis of parental initiative, is reported by very similar percentages for the various program types.

Where program admissions were not based on parental initiative, respondents were asked--in an open-ended question--to describe admission criteria. The data are presented in Table 26. Program and/or research requirement was the most frequently mentioned criterion. Almost half (46 percent) of the programs for which this criterion was reported were laboratory schools, one-third were the combination-type programs, and about one-fifth were nursery school programs. It should be noted that no day care center employed that admission criterion. University affiliation was the next most frequently mentioned admission criterion (even though the questionnaire offered as an illustration of other criteria "children of students have first priority"). This was the main criterion reported for nursery school and day care programs (48 percent and 38 percent, respectively); it was mentioned for very few laboratory schools (5 percent). Perhaps it may be of interest to note that the child's readiness was reported as a basis for admission to only two programs; both were nursery school programs.

Since there is considerable interest about the linkages between the pre-kindergarten programs and the academic institution, and about the sectors of the academic community served by the pre-kindergarten programs, an additional questionnaire item simply asked whether enrollment is limited to children of students. (See Appendix C, item 28) Overall, only 12 percent of the campus pre-kindergarten programs were reported as limiting enrollment to children of students. (See Table 27) Disregarding program types, this means 88 percent do not place that restriction on enrollment. However, major differences on this issue reportedly exist between the various types of programs. Unexpectedly, the day care programs apparently are least liberal, that is, most restrictive in limiting enrollment to children of university or college students; 42 percent of

the day care programs were reported as having that limitation upon their enrollment. This compares with only 5 percent of the nursery school programs. None of the laboratory school programs impose that enrollment limitation. (The combination-type programs resemble the nursery school and laboratory school programs in this regard.) These findings should not be construed to mean that the clientele of the nursery school, laboratory school, and combination-type programs on campus are completely without university affiliation. Although the survey was not able to determine the extent, these types of programs doubtlessly enroll children of faculty and university staff.

Table 26.--Criteria for Acceptance to Pre-K Programs, by Type of Program (in Percent)

Criteria for acceptance	All reporting	Type			
		Day care	Nursery school	Lab school	Other
Total	100.0% (n=64)	23.4	31.9	22.4	22.4
University affiliation	100.0% (n=21)	38.1	47.6	4.8	9.5
Program and/or research requirement	100.0% (n=24)	---	20.8	45.8	33.3
Child's readiness	100.0% (n=2)	---	100.0	---	---
Combination of above	100.0% (n=5)	40.0	20.0	---	40.0
Other	100.0% (n=12)	41.7	16.7	16.7	25.0

Table 27.--Enrollment Limitation to Children of Students, by Type of Program (in Percent)

Enrollment limited	Total	Type			
		Day care	Nursery school	Lab school	Other
All reporting	100.0% (n=116)	100.0% (n=26)	100.0% (n=38)	100.0% (n=26)	100.0% (n=26)
Yes	12.1	42.3	5.3	--	3.8
No	87.9	57.7	94.7	100.0	96.2

Another point of interest explored was the possible relationship of the program clientele to such features of operation as the daily program schedule. From the data presented in Table 28 it may be seen that most nursery schools, combination-type programs, and laboratory school programs on campuses have a uniform pattern of daily attendance for the children. (The respective percentages are 92, 81, and 92.) Seventy-seven percent of the day care centers make a flexible adaptation of the daily schedule; adaptation to the parent's schedule was reported for 69 percent of the day care centers. A flexible schedule adapted to the parent's needs was reported for only 8 percent of the nursery school programs. Only 4 percent of the laboratory schools make that adaptation, but 15 percent make flexible program arrangements for other reasons.

Speaking broadly, schedule arrangements can be aimed in one of two directions: they may be adapted generally to the clientele (a clientele orientation), or they may be based on the expectation that the clientele will adapt to the program schedule (program orientation). The data in Table 28 indicate that three-fourths of the day care centers take a clientele, or consumer, orientation; 80 to 90 percent of all the remaining types take a program, or producer, orientation.

As a check on the orientation reflected in the program schedule, the respondents were asked whether the hours of program operation were set to conform to the academic schedule of the students whose children were enrolled. (See Appendix C, item 30) Sixty percent of the affirmative replies pertain to day care programs; 23 percent to nursery schools; and 3 percent to laboratory schools. (See Table 29) These findings tend to corroborate the data presented above regarding the extent to which the various program types are oriented to the clientele in devising the program schedules.

Table 28.--Uniformity/Flexibility of Children's Daily Attendance, by Type of Program (in Percent)

Uniformity/ flexibility	Type			
	Day care	Nursery school	Lab school	Other
All reporting	100.0% (n=26)	100.0% (n=38)	100.0% (n=26)	100.0% (n=26)
Uniform	23.1	92.1	80.8	92.3
Flexible:				
Adapted to parent's schedule	69.2	7.9	3.8	7.7
Other adaptations	7.7	---	15.4	---

Table 29.--Program Schedule Adapted to Academic Needs of Parents Who Are Students, by Type of Program (in Percent)

Schedule adapted		Type			
		Day care	Nursery school	Lab school	Other
	All reporting				
Yes	100.0% (n=30)	60.0	23.3	3.3	13.3
No	100.0% (n=62)	9.7	37.1	29.0	24.2

To some professional early childhood specialists, adjustment of the program schedule to parents' needs (that is, to their academic schedules) may seem questionable. Perhaps to some specialists the term "flexible" in this content would be seen as a cosmetic, hiding a blemish--the erratic, haphazard scheduling of pre-kindergarten program activities. As a crude effort to gauge this, respondents were asked whether the terms "drop-in center" or "baby-sitting" described their program. (See Appendix C, item 31) The replies for about one-fourth of the day care programs were in the affirmative; those for all the laboratory school and nursery school programs were in the negative. Whether only day care programs which are "flexibly adapted" to parental schedules, but not the nursery school programs, are blemished can only be left to conjecture (and further research).

Several items in the questionnaire sought to obtain data describing the parents of the children, specifically their roles in relation to their university affiliation. Unfortunately, several of these items did not produce usable data. (Perhaps the questions were not well constructed, or the respondents may not have had available the data requested or may not have been willing to make estimates.)

From Table 30 it may be seen that overall--across all program types--44 percent of the respondents reported more mothers are students (full or part time) than are the fathers of the children, but 43 percent reported more fathers than mothers as students. In short, there is no clear-cut pattern indicating whether the mothers or the fathers of the children in all the various programs predominate as students. However, for most of the day care programs (78 percent) a majority of student-mothers was reported, while for the nursery school, laboratory school, and combination-type programs a majority of student-fathers (56, 53, and 56 percent, respectively) was reported. In other words, the chances are that if a child in a day care program on campus has a parent who is a student, it is very likely to be the mother; however, if a parent of the child in a nursery school or laboratory school program is a student, it is likely the student-parent is the father. (Some additional, fragmentary data suggest more fathers are full-time than part-time students.)

Aside from their roles as students, the family role of the mothers of the pre-kindergarten children is of interest. (See Table 31) The data indicate that, overall, relatively few mothers are the heads of their families--7 out of 10 respondents report less than 15 percent of the mothers occupy that position in the family. Considerably higher percentages of mothers with children in day care programs, however, are the heads of their families than are mothers of children in the nursery school, laboratory school, and combination-type programs. More than half (54 percent) of the day care program directors estimated that over 15 percent of the mothers head families; only 16 percent of nursery school directors and 18 percent of laboratory school directors reported comparable estimates.

Table 30.--Comparative Frequency of Parents Who Are Students, by Type of Program (in Percent)

Comparative frequency	Total	Type			
		Day care	Nursery school	Lab school	Other
All reporting	100.0% (n=81)	100.0% (n=23)	100.0% (n=27)	100.0% (n=15)	100.0% (n=16)
More mothers than fathers	44.4	78.3	37.0	33.?	18.8
More fathers than mothers	43.2	13.0	55.6	53.3	56.3
Equal number of fathers and mothers	12.3	8.7	7.4	13.3	25.0

Table 31.--Proportion of Mothers Who Head Families, by Type of Program (in Percent)

Proportion of mothers who head families	Total	Type			
		Day care	Nursery school	Lab school	Other
All reporting	100.0% (n=107)	100.0% (n=24)	100.0% (n=37)	100.0% (n=22)	100.0% (n=24)
Up to 5%	38.3	16.7	48.6	31.8	50.0
5-9%	25.2	12.5	35.1	40.9	8.3
10-14%	7.5	16.7	--	9.1	8.3
15% and over	29.0	54.2	16.2	18.2	33.3

In addition to estimating the number and types of programs, and to sketching the linkages between the programs and their academic setting, a goal of the survey was to describe selected features of existing programs. The data presented in this chapter pertain to that objective. The features reported on primarily pertain to size of the programs, schedules, finances, and staffing.

Before turning to the consideration of those topics, two miscellaneous items will be discussed. The first concerns how long the pre-kindergarten programs have been in existence. The data appear in Table 32. Overall, 47 percent of the campus pre-kindergarten programs had been in operation 7 years or more at the time of the survey; that is, they were established no later than 1964. The majority (53 percent) were 6 years old or less. And almost one-fourth (24 percent) of all the programs were virtually in their infancy--they were established roughly within 1 year of the survey period.

Table 32.--Year Pre-K Programs Were Established, by Type of Program (in Percent)

Year established	Total	Type			
		Day care	Nursery school	Lab school	Other
All reporting	100.0% (n=106)	100.0% (n=26)	100.0% (n=35)	100.0% (n=24)	100.0% (n=21)
Before 1917	1.9	--	2.9	4.2	---
1917-1939	18.9	--	28.6	29.1	14.3
1940-1959	20.8	3.8	31.4	29.1	14.3
1960-1964	5.7	--	11.4	4.2	4.8
1965-1969	29.2	30.8	17.1	29.1	47.6
1970 and later	23.6	65.4	8.5	4.2	19.0

The day care programs exercise a youthful influence on the overall age distribution of the programs. It may be seen that 96 percent of the campus day care programs had been established after 1964; the relatively newborn quality of campus day care programs is further indicated by the finding

that just under two-thirds of the campus day care programs in the sample were established in 1970 or 1971.[1]

Nursery and laboratory school programs were, on the average, much older than the day care programs. Indeed, almost two-thirds of the nursery and laboratory school programs (63 and 62 percent, respectively) were at least 12 years old, and one of each dated back to pre-World War I days. This age or stability may count for some of the relative similarity between the estimated number of such programs from this survey and the number reported from the 1951 "census." (See Appendix Table 1) But it should not be assumed there are no newborn nursery or laboratory school programs. One-fourth of the campus nursery schools were established after 1964, as were exactly one-third of the laboratory school programs.

Table 33.--Certification of Pre-K Programs, by Type of Program (in Percent)

Certification	Total	Type			
		Day care	Nursery school	Lab school	Other
All reporting	100.0% (n=114)	100.0% (n=27)	100.0% (n=37)	100.0% (n=25)	100.0% (n=25)
Licensed	24.6	44.4	16.2	20.0	20.0
Registered	25.4	14.8	32.4	24.0	28.0
Both licensed and registered	8.8	3.7	10.8	16.0	4.0
Neither licensed nor registered	41.2	37.0	40.5	40.0	48.0

The respondents were asked to report whether the programs were licensed or registered. (These terms have differing legal meaning in the various States. A license usually means a legal permit to operate

1. A report in 1970 also indicates that day care centers operated by hospitals are relatively young--a majority were less than 5 years old. See U.S. Dept. of Labor, Women's Bureau, Child Care Services Provided by Hospitals (Washington: U.S. GPO, 1970), Bulletin 295, p. 5.

the program which is awarded on the basis of meeting the licensing standards; these standards and their implementation vary considerably among the States. Registration usually means simply being officially recorded in a list but may also implicitly or explicitly mean having met standards or regulations set forth by the registering authority.) The certification status of the programs is presented in Table 33.

Fifty-nine percent of all the programs are either licensed or registered or both. There are some slight differences in this regard between the various types of programs. Day care centers are licensed or registered in slightly higher percentages than the other types; of the day care centers which were reported as having some certification status, the majority are licensed. In contrast, the majority of nursery schools and laboratory schools which have certification status are registered. About 4 out of 10 programs lack any certification status; the day care programs have a slightly smaller proportion without certification status (37 percent), and the combination-type are highest in this regard (48 percent).

A. Size of Programs

The aggregate and average enrollment per program are shown in Table 34. The aggregate number of children enrolled in all of the reporting programs is 5,220. Ranked by size of aggregate enrollment, nursery school programs are first with almost 1,700, followed by laboratory schools with almost 1,400. Day care centers have almost 1,200, and the combination-type programs, 1,000.

Table 34.--Number of Children Enrolled in Pre-K Programs, by Type of Program

No. of children	Type			
	Day care	Nursery school	Lab school	Other
Aggregate	1,161	1,671	1,377	1,011
Average per program*	45	43	53	39

*Identical to "average class size" only for programs run on a full-day or only one half-day basis. (Some lab and nursery schools operate two "half-day" classes.)

The estimated national average enrollment of campus pre-kindergarten programs (mentioned in Chapter III) is 40 children. The averages per type of program presented in Table 34 are not weighted averages and, therefore, vary to some degree from the national figure. Apparently laboratory schools have the highest enrollment per program--53 children. This compares with 45 for day care and 43 for nursery school programs. Data on the program schedules, presented later, give some ground for questioning the nursery school and laboratory school average enrollments reported here. The reason for doubt is that nursery school and laboratory school programs include full-day programs as well as half-day programs and also some with two half-day programs. Put differently, the average number per program is probably not identical to "class" size.

Perhaps this explanation applies also to the data on size of enrollment by various categories presented in Appendix Table 3. The data indicate that the nursery schools and combination-type programs have a majority of programs with an enrollment of less than 40 children. The highest proportion (65 percent) of programs with enrollments exceeding 40 children was reported for laboratory schools. Again, the caution must be given that the enrollment data for laboratory schools must also be examined in connection with the daily duration of the various programs (presented in Table 39).

Enrollment in the various pre-kindergarten programs also varies according to the ages of the children. (See Table 35) Day care programs have the largest aggregate number of younger children (under 3 years of age), although there is a larger absolute number of nursery schools in the sample (39) and the number of day care and laboratory school programs in the sample are virtually equal (27 and 26, respectively). (See Table 6) The data in Table 35 indicate, furthermore, that the day care programs also have the highest average number of younger children per program (17).

The findings which pertain to the children in the 3-to-4-year age range present a different picture. Larger aggregate numbers of these children are reported for nursery school and laboratory school programs than for day care programs. Also, day care programs appear to have a smaller average number of children in this age range (39) than do laboratory and nursery schools (54 and 42, respectively). It must be remembered that this average is identical to "average class size" for programs with a full-day class or only one half-day class. Some nursery school and laboratory school programs operate two half-day classes each day.

Unused capacity is another aspect of the size of the programs. Data on that aspect are shown in Table 36. Only 1 out of 5 laboratory schools and 1 out of 4 nursery school programs are reported as having unused capacity (or as under-enrolled). In contrast, more than 2 out

Table 35.--Number of Children Under and Over 3 Years of Age Enrolled in Pre-K Programs, by Type of Program

No. of children	Total	Type			
		Day care	Nursery school	Lab school	Other
		Under age 3			
Aggregate	349	248	44	33	24
Average per program	14	17	15	8	8
		Ages 3-5			
Aggregate	4,820	895	1,627	1,344	954
Average per program	43	39	42	54	40

Table 36.--Unused Capacity of Pre-K Programs, by Type of Program (in Percent)

Unused capacity	Type			
	Day care	Nursery school	Lab school	Other
All reporting	100.0% (n=26)	100.0% (n=39)	100.0% (n=25)	100.0% (n=26)
None	30.8	74.4	80.0	46.2
1-5 children	7.7	2.6	8.0	11.5
6-10 children	11.5	7.7	---	7.7
11-15 children	11.5	2.6	4.0	7.7
16-20	3.8	5.1	4.0	7.7
21 or more	34.6	7.7	4.0	19.2

of 3 day care programs are reported as under-enrolled. Furthermore, the data indicate a greater degree or amount of unused capacity in day care programs, on the average, than in laboratory and nursery school programs.

These findings on unused capacity, or under-enrollment, are generally corroborated by the information about waiting lists. (See Table 37) More than 9 out of 10 (92 percent) of the laboratory school and nursery school programs were reported as having a waiting list, compared with 56 percent of the day care programs. Also consistent with the earlier findings is the number of children reported on the waiting lists of the various program types. (See Table 38) On the average, laboratory school programs in the sample had 126 children on their waiting lists; nursery schools, 99; and day care programs, 29. Overall, the estimated average number on waiting lists in each program on the Nation's campuses is 63 children.

Table 37.--Pre-K Programs With a Waiting List, by Type of Program (in Percent)

Waiting list reported	Total	Type			
		Day care	Nursery school	Lab school	Other
All reporting	100.0% (n=112)	100.0% (n=25)	100.0% (n=38)	100.0% (n=25)	100.0% (n=24)
Yes	81.3	56.0	92.1	92.0	79.2
No	18.7	44.0	7.9	8.0	20.8

An aggregate of 7,400 children was reported on the waiting lists of the programs in the sample. That figure exceeds the aggregate enrollment of 5,200. This means that about seven children are on the waiting list for every five enrolled. (The waiting list data may be understated or otherwise inaccurate; only 90 of the 118 programs in the sample responded to this item.)

B. Program Schedules

The different types of programs vary on a number of the features already reported. As may be seen in Table 39, they also vary in regard to

Table 38.--Number of Children on Waiting Lists of Pre-K Programs, by Type of Program

No. of children	Total	Type			
		Day care	Nursery school	Lab school	Other
Aggregate	7,404	404	3,469	2,781	750
Average per program	63*	29	99	126	39

*A national average estimated by weighting averages for the "small" and "large" strata.

Table 39.--Daily Duration of Pre-K Programs, by Type of Program (in Percent)

Daily duration	Total	Type			
		Day care	Nursery school	Lab school	Other
All reporting	100.0% (n=117)	100.0% (n=27)	100.0% (n=38)	100.0% (n=26)	100.0% (n=26)
Full-day only	42.7	96.3	28.9	26.9	23.1
Half-day only	29.9	---	39.5	26.9	50.0
Two half-days	19.7	3.7	23.7	38.5	11.5
Other	7.7	---	7.9	7.7	15.4

program schedule. Almost all the programs designated as day care (96 percent) are operated a "full day" (generally, 4 or more hours each day). Only a minority of nursery schools and laboratory schools (29 and 27 percent, respectively) run such full-day classes. Not quite two-thirds of the nursery school and laboratory school programs (63 and 65 percent, respectively) consist of one or of two half-day classes each day. Over one-third (39 percent) of the laboratory schools run two half-day classes each day. This pattern of program scheduling may

explain the higher average number of children reported enrolled in laboratory schools, as was discussed earlier.

The meaning of "full-day" and "half-day" classes is not simple. Generally speaking, one of the program schedule categories is adopted--full-day, one half-day, or two half-day classes. Some programs, however, combine a full-day class and a half-day class. Moreover, not all of the children in a given program or class attend the program or class for a uniform number of hours. That is, as may be recalled from the earlier discussion of the flexibility or uniformity of programs, special programing arrangements may be made for some children. Data on this complicated issue are presented in Appendix Table 4. Those data indicate that 28 percent of the day care programs are operated on a 3-hours-a-day basis for the majority of the children. (This exceeds the 4 percent of the day care programs which were reported as operating on a two half-days basis.) The data on the average number of hours the majority of children attend each day in the laboratory school and nursery school programs, however, are more closely consistent with the reports of the number of such programs operating on a full-day basis. (Twenty-nine percent of the nursery schools are reported as full-day programs, which is consistent with the report that 30 percent operate for 4 or more hours for the majority of the children. Twenty-seven percent of the laboratory school directors stated they run on a full-day basis, which compares closely with the 29 percent having a majority of the children attending for 4 hours or more.)

Finally, there may be interest in the programs which have a majority of children attending for very long durations (7 or more hours a day). The data indicate, as might have been expected, that a higher proportion (20 percent) of day care programs are reported to have a majority of the children for a long duration than the other program types. (Four percent of the programs in the "other" category, however, are reported to have children attending for a period of from 9 to 12 hours.)

Table 40 sketches the daily schedule from another perspective. It reveals the percentages of the various program types in each daily category. These data serve to reinforce the findings in Table 39 that campus day care programs largely conform to expectations of operating on a full-day basis, but the expectation that nursery school and laboratory school programs operate only on a half-day basis is not completely borne out. Nursery schools constitute 22 percent of campus pre-kindergarten programs that operate on a full-day basis; laboratory schools make up 14 percent.

Other facets of the program schedules are portrayed in several appendix tables. Appendix Table 5 provides information on meals served

in the pre-kindergarten programs. Somewhat unexpected is the finding that 69 percent of the laboratory schools serve meals; perhaps the large percentage of laboratory schools with two half-day classes accounts for this. As might have been expected, the day care programs run a very close second in providing meals (64 percent).

Table 40.--Type of Pre-K Programs, by Daily Duration (in Percent)

Type	Daily duration		
	Full-day only	Half-day only	2 half-days
All reporting	100.0% (n=50)	100.0% (n=35)	100.0% (n=23)
Day care	52.0	---	4.3
Nursery school	22.0	42.9	39.1
Lab school	14.0	20.0	43.5
Other	12.0	37.1	13.0

The data in Appendix Table 6 describe the weekly program schedules. The finding that the majority of children in over half of the campus day care programs attend for 20 hours or less each week comes as a surprise only if the weekly schedule was assumed to be the sum of five equal daily sessions for all or a majority of the children. That assumption may be more warranted for the nursery school and laboratory school programs. The finding that 16 percent of the nursery school and 9 percent of the laboratory school programs have a majority of children in attendance between 21 and 40 hours each week again confirms the existence of "full-day" operations in those program types.

Data on the annual program schedule appear in Table 41. Six out of 10 campus day care programs have an annual schedule longer than the traditional academic year of 9 to 10 months. Virtually all campus nursery school programs (97 percent) follow the usual academic calendar. Three out of 10 laboratory schools, however, operate for as many as 11 or 12 months each year.

C. Finances

Figures on operating budgets, cost per child, and fees charged

were the pieces of financial information obtained in the survey. Paradoxically, interest appears highest on the very items of information which seem--in this and other surveys--least reliable. Financial data in this field, especially but not solely from mail questionnaires, regularly exhibit an exceedingly wide range and variability.[2] Common sense would suggest that the range and variation reflect differences in costs between geographic areas, differences in program schedules (daily and annual), and adherence to different levels of program standards. The data to be presented shortly, regrettably, appear to defy common sense, at least with regard to program schedules.

Table 41.--Length of Pre-K Program Year, by Type of Program (in Percent)

No. of months per year	Type			
	Day care	Nursery school	Lab school	Other
All reporting	100.0% (n=26)	100.0% (n=38)	100.0% (n=26)	100.0% (n=26)
9 months or less	34.5	71.1	50.0	65.3
10 months	3.8	26.3	19.2	19.2
11 months	15.4	2.6	19.2	7.7
12 months	46.2	--	11.5	7.7

2. See U.S. Dept. of Labor, Women's Bureau, Day Care Services: Industry's Involvement (Washington: U.S. GPO, 1971), Bulletin 296, p.23; and Kahn, op. cit., p. 146. For a discussion of the problem in depth, see Arnold Gurin, et al., Cost Analysis in Day Care Centers for Children (Waltham, Mass.: Brandeis University, 1966).

Another source of unreliability is the high rate of non-response to financial items in survey instruments.[3] For example, only 57 percent of respondents in this survey provided data on the annual per capita cost of operating their programs; a smaller proportion (47 percent) reported their annual operating budgets. For some respondents, the non-response may reflect skittishness regarding sensitive information. (In institutions of higher education, as in other large organizations, program budgets are not always freely revealed.) For others, it may bespeak a lack of available data, or difficulty in collecting or estimating the figures. (Many pre-kindergarten programs are small enterprises managed by staff without skill in accountancy.)

Furthermore, campus programs vary widely in the amount of in-kind contributions (for example, faculty salaries) and in the way such contributions are "costed out." The great variety in bookkeeping practices may well account for much of the variation in the data.

Another problem in discussing such data stems from naive notions about cost. In a service market as variegated and as relatively unplanned as pre-kindergarten programs, fiscal comparability between programs should not be expected as a "natural" condition. More likely, valid comparability will emerge as standardization of operations and of accounting procedures develop.

The foregoing remarks are intended to caution the reader that questionable data lie ahead. Aside from wide interest, the information is presented in the belief that accuracy is the outcome of an iterative process in which this survey is hopefully one step.

Table 42 shows average annual operating budgets in relation to daily and annual program schedules. Anomalies are widespread in the data (full-day programs appear to have smaller annual operating budgets than half-day programs, but programs operating for 11 to 12 months usually--not always--have higher budgets than programs with a shorter annual duration). The range in average annual operating budgets is very wide--from $3,000 (for full-day, 10-month programs) to about $99,000 (for 10-month programs with two half-day classes).

Some of this variability may be due to some programs having included, while others excluded, rent or capital costs in their operating budgets. Even taking this possibility into account, however, does not explain many puzzling figures. For example, of the programs in the highest class of annual operating budgets, only half included rent or capital costs.

3. For a similar survey experience, see Kahn, op.cit., p. 146.

Table 42.--Average Annual Operating Budget of Pre-K Programs,* by Daily and Annual Duration of Program

Daily duration	Annual duration		
	9 months	10 months	11-12 months
Full-day	$8,117	$3,000	$38,740
Half-day	$12,578	$6,350	$26,400
Two half-days	$33,675	$98,989	$51,333
Other	$28,000	$25,000	- -

* n=56.

(See Appendix Table 7) For a detailed list which displays the wide fluctuations in program operating budgets (excluding rent or capital costs) in relation to program type and annual duration, see Appendix Table 8. Appendix Tables 9, 10 and 11 relate budgets, program type, and annual and daily duration.

The estimated national annual average per capita cost of campus pre-kindergarten programs is $635 (with a 95 percent confidence range of from $415 to $850). Table 43 shows the unweighted averages for the programs in the sample in relation to their daily and annual program schedules. Excluding the combination-type programs, full-day programs operating from 11 to 12 months a year have the highest average per capita cost ($1,117). But the lowest average ($214) is reported for full-day programs operating for 9 months.

Average per capita cost in relation to program type and annual duration is shown in Table 44. As before, some of the figures are not clearly comprehensible (for example, nursery school and laboratory school programs operating for 11 to 12 months are much less costly than the same types operating for 10 months). Laboratory school programs seem to have the highest average per capita costs ($1,936 and $1,130 for 10-month and 9-month programs, respectively). Day care programs range from $104 average annual per capita cost (for 9-month programs) to $1,107 (for 11- to 12-month programs). That high average falls below the 1967 minimum standard for such programs based on Project Headstart experience ($1,245); it is considerably below the acceptable standard ($1,862) and one-half that of the desirable standard ($2,320).[4]

4. Day Care Services: Industry's Involvement, op.cit., Table 3, p.23.

For data on annual per capita cost in relation to annual and daily program schedule, see Appendix Table 12.

Table 43.--Average Annual Per Capita Cost of Pre-K Programs,* by Daily and Annual Duration of Program

Daily duration	Annual duration		
	9 months	10 months	11-12 months
Full day	$214	$290	$1,117
Half-day	$433	--	$310
Two half-days	$647	$955	$600
Other	$600	$1,550	$390

* n=48.

Table 44.--Average Annual Per Capita Cost of Pre-K Programs,* by Type and Annual Duration of Program

Type	Annual duration		
	9 months	10 months	11-12 months
Day care	$104	$518	$1,107
Nursery school	$343	$1,012	$230
Lab school	$1,130	$1,936	$541
Other	$491	$908	$847

* n=48.

The estimated average weekly fee charged for pre-kindergarten programs on the Nation's campuses is $7.55 (with a 95 percent confidence range from $5.60 to $9.45). The average unweighted fees charged for the programs in the sample are presented in Table 45. The highest average fee ($9.62) is charged for full-day programs. Programs with one half-day class have, on the average, the lowest fee ($5.70). See Appendix Table 13 for additional data on average fees and daily program duration.

Table 45.--Average Weekly Fee Paid, by Daily Duration of Pre-K Program*

Daily duration	Average weekly fee paid
Full-day	$9.62
Half-day	$5.70
Two half-days	$6.44
Other	$6.75

*n=87; 28 respondents report not charging fees.

D. Staff

Probably no other attributes produce greater effects on operating costs and quality of pre-kindergarten programs than the number, ratio (to enrollment), and qualifications of staff. Their significance is expressed in the emphasis upon staffing standards in every set of pace-setting program standards in the fields of day care and early childhood education.[5] These attributes also lend themselves to relatively objective formulation as questionnaire items. For reasons of both significance and ease of being objectified, information was collected about the programs in the sample on the number of staff in the various program roles, their work and pay status, child/adult ratios, and education of principal program staff. These data are reported on here. (Since the tabulations are necessarily very detailed, they appear in Appendix E and are summarized below.)

Data on the typical staff pattern in day care programs are to be found in Appendix Tables 14, 15, 16, and 17. Most campus day care programs have a full-time, paid director. Less than half have a full-time teacher, but teachers--whether on a full- or part-time basis--are likely to be paid. About 1 out of 2 day care programs has at least one assistant teacher, usually on a part-time basis, and/or one or more

5. See, for example, Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements, op.cit.; Child Welfare League of America, Standards for Day Care Service (New York: CWLA, 1969); "Day Nurseries for Preschoolers," op. cit.; and Alice V. Keliher, "Effective Learning and Teacher-Pupil Ratio" (A Position Paper of) Association for Childhood Education International, Washington, D.C.

teacher aides on a part-time basis. One out of 3 day care programs has a part-time housekeeper and a part-time clerk; such staff are likely to be paid. Atypical among day care programs are those with from four to eight paid teachers, assistant teachers, or teacher aides. (These are likely to be employed on a part-time basis.)

Typically, day care programs also have one or more unpaid volunteers serving as teacher aides; these may include student-teachers and parents. A few programs have as many as 15 to 50 volunteers. Day care programs generally have more volunteers in every program role than the other program types.

Data on the staff of campus nursery school programs appear in Appendix Tables 18, 19, 20, and 21. Not all nursery school programs have a director, but usually, whether on a full- or part-time basis, the director is a paid employee. Typically, each nursery school program has one or more full-time, paid teachers; about 1 out of 2 such programs has one or more part- or full-time, paid assistant teachers or teacher aides; in the 1 out of 3 nursery school programs with a clerk (more likely part than full time), the clerk is paid; about every other nursery school program has a paid housekeeper, who is more often part than full time. A few atypical programs have as many as four or five paid teachers, assistant teachers, or teacher aides.

Nursery school programs are less likely than day care programs to have volunteer staff; some, however, report as many as 15 to 40 volunteers. In the 1 out of 3 nursery school programs with volunteers, the volunteers mainly serve as teacher aides.

The information on staff of campus laboratory schools may be found in Appendix Tables 22, 23, and 24. Most laboratory school programs have a director, and slightly more than half have a full-time director. The director, whether full or part time, is paid. Laboratory schools typically have one or more full-time teachers, and 1 out of 3 such programs has additionally one or more part-time teachers. Regardless of their work schedules, the teachers in laboratory schools usually are also paid staff. Almost one-fourth of the laboratory schools on campuses can boast of four or more full-time teachers. The typical laboratory school also has one or more paid assistant teachers, more often part time than full time. Furthermore, every other laboratory school program also has one or more teacher aides, but these staff members are as likely to be unpaid volunteers as to be paid. Approximately half of the laboratory school programs have a paid (full- or part-time) housekeeper and a clerk.

Several laboratory school programs report as many as 15 to 50 volunteers serving as teacher aides. Otherwise, the number of volunteers reported in laboratory school programs is too negligible to warrant tabular presentation.

In comparing these typical staff patterns, it appears that laboratory school programs are better staffed than the day care and nursery school programs. That is, laboratory schools typically seem to have more staff in each of the program roles, more full-time staff, and more paid staff than the other program types thus far mentioned. The only exception to this general comparison is the greater likelihood that day care programs have a larger number of volunteers.

The typical staff pattern of the "other" or combination-type pre-kindergarten programs which follows summarizes the data in Appendix Tables 25, 26, and 27. Almost all combination-type programs have a paid director, who is more often a full-time than a part-time staff member. Typically, they have one or more teachers (as likely full as part time), most of whom are paid. Approximately 1 out of 2 of the combination-type programs has an assistant teacher or a teacher aide; most of these also are paid. Approximately every other program of this type has a paid housekeeper (as likely full as part time) and a paid clerk (most often on a part-time basis).

About every other combination-type program has one or more volunteers serving as teacher aides; a few have between 15 and 50 volunteers. Otherwise, so few volunteers seem to be associated with these programs as to not warrant tabular presentation.

The number of children per adult is one of the key indicators of staffing standards. Many such standards recommend (or require) different ratios for the various age groups. Data on the average ratios for the age groups in different program types are shown in Table 46. In regard to the very young children (up to 3 years of age), day care programs do not appear under-staffed or over-enrolled in comparison with either laboratory or nursery school programs on campuses. (The ratio data on very young children were reported by a relatively small number of programs, especially of nursery school programs. See Appendix Table 28.) In the older age groups (3 to 5 years of age), however, day care programs show comparatively the highest child/adult ratios. The greatest difference in child/adult ratios between the three specific program types is that between the 8.9 children per adult in the 4-to-5-year age group in day care programs and the 6.7 ratio in nursery school programs. Laboratory school programs, surprisingly, do not uniformly display lower ratios than the day care or nursery school programs.

Of all the program types, only the combination-type programs on the average meet recommended Federal day care standards on child/adult ratios.[6] Those standards call for a total ratio in the 3-to-4-year age range not greater than five children to one adult. The Federal standard for the 4-to-5-year age group, not more than seven children to one adult, is met on the average only by the combination-type programs and nursery school programs.

6. Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements, op.cit.

Table 46.--Average Number of Children Per Adult in Pre-K Programs, by Age Group and Type of Program

Age group*	Type			
	Day care	Nursery school	Lab school	Other
Under 1 year	2.7	--	2.5	--
1-2 years	3.8	6.0	4.0	--
2-3 years	5.3	2.0	5.8	4.0
3-4 years	7.3	6.0	5.7	4.2
4-5 years	8.9	6.7	7.1	4.3

*See Appendix Table 28 for the number of respondents reporting these data.

Campus pre-kindergarten programs, as a result of being--or being seen as--part of an academic institution, may be expected to be models of their type. As regards the number of children per adult, however, the average program does not appear to meet that expectation. To be sure, an average value, as a statistic, combines cases falling above as well as below that value. Doubtlessly, therefore, some individual programs meet or exceed desirable standards of child/adult ratios (in addition to the exceptional, but difficult to categorize, combination-type programs). Clearly among those exceptions also are the six programs (out of 118) reporting more than one adult per child.

The only information bearing upon the qualification of staff obtained in the survey concerns the education of the principal program staff--the directors and the head teachers. Data on the education of the pre-kindergarten directors are presented in Table 47. All of the laboratory school directors and the directors of almost 9 out of 10 of the nursery school and combination-type programs have earned a graduate degree or taken some graduate work. That level of educational attainment is reported for slightly more than half (52 percent) of the day care program directors. Another third (35 percent) of the day care program directors hold baccalaureate degrees.

The educational attainment of the laboratory school directors should not be surprising. A prior survey of child development centers (which the laboratory schools are believed to resemble) found that all the administrative officers of those centers had doctorate degrees (mainly Ph.D. degrees).[7]

7. Kahn, op.cit., p. 166.

Table 47.--Highest Education Level Achieved by Directors of Pre-K Programs, by Type of Program (in Percent)

Education of director	Total	Type			
		Day care	Nursery school	Lab school	Other
All reporting*	100.0% (n=111)	100.0% (n=23)	100.0% (n=37)	100.0% (n=26)	100.0% (n=25)
Some college	3.6	13.0	---	---	4.0
Baccalaureate degree	12.6	34.8	10.7	---	8.0
Graduate work or degree	83.8	52.1	89.3	100.0	88.0

*Excludes 2 programs without a director and 5 no responses to this item.

As a group, the head teachers have not achieved as high an educational level as the program directors. (See Table 48) Again, the head teachers in the laboratory schools show the largest percentage with a graduate degree or graduate work (83 percent). The head teachers in approximately two-thirds of all the other program types, including day care programs, have had a post-graduate education. In all of the program types, if the head teacher has not done graduate work or achieved a graduate degree, she (or he) is likely to have earned a baccalaureate.

Table 48.--Highest Education Level Achieved by Head Teachers of Pre-K Programs, by Type of Program (in Percent)

Education of head teacher	Total	Type			
		Day care	Nursery school	Lab school	Other
All reporting*	100.0% (n=91)	100.0% (n=17)	100.0% (n=32)	100.0% (n=23)	100.0% (n=19)
Some college	3.3	5.9	---	---	10.5
Baccalaureate degree	26.4	29.4	34.4	17.4	21.0
Graduate work or degree	70.3	64.7	65.6	82.6	68.4

*Excludes 9 programs in which the director and head teacher are the same person and 18 no responses to this item.

CHAPTER VII - SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The survey collected essentially descriptive information. In the foregoing chapters the analyses made of the data are quite objective--only minimally were interpretations made of or inferences drawn from the data presented. Yet, the data carry implications for several broad issues. First, data on the prevalence and magnitude of campus pre-kindergarten programs bear upon the educational mission of the institutions of higher education. Second, some data permit inferences about the goals and quality of the pre-kindergarten programs. Third, still other data may be interpreted in relation to student activism. The present chapter explores the meaning of the previously presented data in terms of those broad issues.

The prevalence, magnitude, and cost of the pre-kindergarten programs may be examined to assess how salient the pre-kindergarten programs are for the sponsoring institutions of higher education. Based on the data from our sample survey, 425 pre-kindergarten programs are estimated for the 1,100 co-educational, senior, accredited colleges and universities in the United States. (The 95 percent confidence range for that estimate is from 366 to 488. See Appendix D.) One or more such programs may be found on every fourth campus among the 1,100 institutions. The average campus pre-kindergarten program is estimated to enroll 40 children. (The 95 percent confidence range is from 32 to 48.) A simple calculation from the survey data suggests, as a rough estimate, a total of 17,000 children enrolled in all of the pre-kindergarten programs on American campuses. (That figure of 17,000 may be viewed as a moderate estimate, with the minimum calculated to be 12,000 and the maximum 23,000.) A majority of the programs (57 percent) are enrolled to capacity and have waiting lists. The waiting lists of those programs record an average of 63 children.

While in absolute terms the aggregate total enrollment (17,000 children) is an impressive figure, it dwindles when compared with the millions of children enrolled in pre-primary programs throughout the country.[1]

That aggregate number of children in campus pre-kindergarten programs shrinks even more in significance when contrasted to the millions

1. Linda H. Barker, Preprimary Enrollment, October 1971, U.S. Dept. of HEW, Office of Education, Publication No. OE-72-197 (Washington: U.S. GPO, 1972).

of students in the various programs of higher education on the college and university campuses.

Financial cost provides another measure of the importance of campus pre-kindergarten programs. (See section C. Finances, in Chapter VI, especially the comments regarding inaccuracies in financial data.) The average annual cost per child in the campus pre-kindergarten programs was estimated at $635. (The 95 percent confidence range for that estimate is from $415 to $850.) Simple multiplication of the estimates of aggregate enrollment and estimates of average annual per capita cost produces further estimates of the total annual cost of such programs. The mid-range estimate of annual cost is $10.8 million, with a minimum of $5 million and a maximum of $19.6 million. Even if these fiscal estimates are inflated by a factor of 2 or 3 to allow for inadequacies in the source data, the total fiscal cost is a mere child's allowance in comparison with the subsidies for extramural athletic games, let alone the multibillion dollar expenditures by the multiversities and university and college systems in the United States.

Who pays the costs of these programs can be answered only in general terms from the survey data. The sponsoring academic institutions and fees paid by parents of enrolled children provide the bulk of funds for operating the campus pre-kindergarten programs. (The average fee charged to parents is estimated to be $7.55 a week, with the 95 percent confidence range for that estimate from $5.60 to $9.45.)

The preceding data on numbers of programs, numbers of children, and fiscal costs indicate that at present pre-kindergarten programs constitute a comparatively miniscule part of the American academic scene. What are the prospects for growth of the pre-kindergarten segment of institutions of higher education? Our survey data provide a static sketch, a portrait at one point in time. Data on the age of the pre-kindergarten programs, however, indicate that campus day care programs are largely a recent phenomenon. Almost all of those in the sample (95 percent) were established since 1964. In contrast, two-thirds of the nursery school and laboratory school programs were established before 1960. Comparison with an enumeration in 1951 suggests a negligible net change in the number of nursery and laboratory schools on campuses in the past 20 years, despite a massive expansion of higher education. (See Chapter III, footnote 2) (Obviously some programs have been discontinued and new ones have been developed in essentially similar numbers, thus offsetting the dropouts.) Based on the recent past, then, a relatively stable total of laboratory and nursery schools, but an increased number of day care programs, might be predicted. Such a forecast, however, appears superficial.

Any prognostication for the decade ahead must take a number of factors into account. The number of potential consumers of campus

pre-kindergarten programs will depend in some measure on the demography of the university and college student population; the number of students, their age, and their age at marriage and at child-bearing will influence consumer demand. The extent to which pre-primary programs become available and accessible within the community at large rather than within the academic community will also affect the pressure for campus programs. The intensity of consumer demand for such programs, which these non-ideological factors affect, will be discussed shortly in terms of student activism.

But of all the factors that bear upon the possible increase or decrease of campus pre-kindergarten programs, none seems more generally critical at this point in time than the financial. The fiscal squeeze on university and college budgets, which began in the early 1970's, most likely will pinch hardest on programs viewed as student services or as tangential. Certainly more than in the years of academic expansion are legislators, trustees, administrators, and faculty likely to raise the challenge: do pre-kindergarten programs serve a higher educational function? It may appear especially tempting to question programs launched by bumptious students. Of course, this challenging question may reflect a conception of appropriate academic functions as well as fiscal concerns. But if the widely predicted stabilization--or, even more serious, contraction--of academic budgets comes about, competition for tighter resources will become more fierce, and the rationale for pre-primary programs in terms of training college students and research may seem quite (or not quite enough) "academic."

The shape of academic budgets in the decade ahead, it is believed here, will have the greatest effect on campus pre-kindergarten programs. And, in general, the prospect for expansion of campus pre-kindergarten programs of all types seems slim. One counter-trend, however, should be noted. As Federal funds for day care--of children of welfare mothers--increase, and programs in the community expand to fill that market, some junior and senior colleges may set up training programs for the staff of the community day care programs. Perhaps those colleges will establish their own day care programs as training sites.

Although the financial factor may actually have the dominant impact on the expansion or contraction of campus pre-kindergarten programs, academicians are not likely to neglect considering the relationship of the programs to the institutional mission of higher education. This brings us to consideration of the goals of pre-kindergarten programs and their relationship to the educational mission of the universities and colleges. Goals of the different pre-kindergarten programs may be inferred from the survey data on criteria for admission to the programs and on the use of the programs for other than direct benefit to the children. The majority of campus programs are reported

to employ the following criteria for admission of the children: research, training needs of college and university students, and university affiliation by the parents. Laboratory schools and nursery schools apparently emphasize program needs and research needs as admission criteria in somewhat greater proportion than other types of programs. Day care centers are more likely to base admission decisions on university affiliation of the parents; a much higher proportion of programs of this type accept only children of students than is true of nursery or laboratory school programs.

Reports on the use of pre-school programs for research and training of college students also serve as clues to goals of the programs. Presumably the goals of research and of training college students legitimate the pre-kindergarten programs from the standpoint of those concerned with the educational mission of the university and college. Admission of children on the basis of university affiliation of their parents, especially affiliation as students, reveals the service function also performed by some of the programs. It must be emphasized that these goals--some held mainly by administrators and faculty, others held mainly by students and university staff--are not mutually exclusive. This emphasis is supported by the evidence that even the most "student oriented" of the programs, the day care programs, are used comparatively more frequently (than other types) by the various academic departments on campuses for research and training of their students.

It may be noted that the above discussion of program goals is silent in regard to education and development of the children in the programs. From the standpoint of the best interests of the children, concern may indeed be voiced over the flexible adjustment of the program schedules to suit the needs of parents (for example, student-parents). One-fourth of the day care programs in the sample are "flexible" to the extent that they themselves acknowledge the applicability to their programs of the phrase "drop-in center."

From the outset, information pertaining to the content and quality of the pre-kindergarten programs was excluded from the scope of the survey. However, the survey did obtain one other datum which provides an important clue to the quality of the programs. The ratio of the number of children per adult is generally recognized as an important indicator of program quality. The nursery school, laboratory school, and day care programs in the sample on the average do not meet the standards of child/adult ratios recommended by the Federal Government for day care programs. (Only the combination-type programs in the sample on the average meet the recommended Federal day care standards on child/adult ratios.) For the rest, one can only conjecture whether the campus programs would disappoint those who expect programs on college and university campuses to be exemplars of their type. Further,

in the absence of reliable evidence, one would have to speculate whether day care programs on campuses are inferior in quality to their academic neighbors, the campus nursery and laboratory school programs. Unbiased study would be needed to make an objective determination.

Programs principally concerned with accommodating parental needs may indeed subordinate the needs of the children. However, the research and training goals which the nursery and laboratory schools presumably emphasize must also be recognized as other than child oriented. All these objectives, which are inferred from the survey data, support the conclusion that "nursery education in the United States has had as its primary objective the welfare of persons other than the children."[2]

That conclusion undermines a related piece of conventional wisdom, the formulation which holds that nursery school is for children whose middle-class parents want to give them an educational leg up (that is, to prepare them for kindergarten), whereas day care is for children of mothers who must work (or study). Such statements ostensibly attribute motives even-handedly to two groups of parents. On closer examination, it may be noted that the aspiration middle-class parents are said to hold for their children is not compared with the hopes attributable to lower class parents for their children, but with the pressures to which these adults are subjected (a dimension of middle-class life neglected in the comparison). That conventional formulation also overlooks an important--embarrassing?--fact: the tacit exchange, accepted by parents of children in campus nursery and laboratory schools, of educational gains from the pre-school programs for use of their children as subjects in research and training projects. Furthermore, such statements imply disinterest on the part of mothers who work or study in the education of their children. Making invidious comparisons and disregarding uncomfortable facts serve as mechanisms by which social and professional biases distort perception of objective reality. Creating artificial disjunctions is another means of obfuscation. A program goal such as research or training of college students is not necessarily incompatible with the goal of serving parents with university affiliation. Nor is willingness to have one's child used as a research subject necessarily contradicted by a desire for the education and socialization of one's child. Nor, furthermore, are the work or study

2. Pauline S. Sears and Edith M. Dowley, "Research on Teaching in the Nursery School," in Handbook of Research on Teaching, ed. N.L. Gage (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963), Chapter 15, cited in Sarah Hammond Leeper, et al., Good Schools for Young Children (New York: Macmillan Co., 1968), p. 47.

status of parents and the desire to have children educated mutually exclusive.

And ideological slugging matches between activist students and defensive administrators and faculty disputing the appropriateness of day care programs to the mission of the academic institutions are not likely to produce clarity. Data from the survey indicate the use being made of campus day care programs for purposes of higher education. Indeed, those programs are used by various academic departments in slightly greater proportion than other types among the programs in the survey sample. This popularity may be due to the greater ideological appeal to many college students of day care programs compared with other pre-kindergarten programs. Day care may receive more publicity in the student press. Furthermore, the attractiveness of day care programs for research or training may reflect the distinctive features of those programs, documented earlier in the report, such as their longer daily and annual program schedules and their larger enrollment of younger children (children under 3 years of age). Having generally been established more recently, the day care programs may also be less formally organized and therefore accessible to students. These distinctive features point to the potential applicability of day care programs to transmitting knowledge and producing knowledge, the mission of institutions of higher education.

This is not to argue, it should go without saying, for the provision of pre-school programs on campuses for the eligible children of all students, faculty, and staff. Surely, however, a line can be drawn between that broadened provision and the desirability of establishing distinctive programs for research and education of college students in early childhood programing and child development--among other disciplines--and for such auxiliary services to students as practicality may justify. This emphasis upon the higher educational functions which day care programs may serve would be anathema to the student militants who spurred on campus day care programs. The discussion will now turn to, and this report conclude with, a brief consideration of student activism in relation to campus day care programs.

According to data from this survey, faculty and university administrators most often initiated the establishment of the campus nursery and laboratory schools, while the initiative for establishment of day care programs was much more likely that of the student-parents. Several programmatic features correlate with the source of program initiation. Only day care programs are located off campus to any appreciable extent (20 percent). Also, three-fourths of the laboratory and nursery schools receive a majority of their operating funds from the institution of higher education; only one-fourth of the day care

programs receive such a level of institutional support.

Consistent with the reports of frequent student initiation of day care programs is the indication that most campus day care programs have been recently established. Data from the survey, therefore, suggest the recent growth of these programs may well be attributable in good measure to the ideological fervor, "righteousness," and "activism" associated with the student rebellions on campus.[3] Such day care programs may therefore be viewed as one of the "academic" achievements of the "student revolution," along with other accomplishments: a greater student voice in academic governance, pass-fail instead of letter grades, co-ed dorms, pacification of campuses (dropping of ROTC and of defense-related research), increased black enrollments, and an emphasis on hiring black and female faculty and staff.

The survey data also show that, in addition to stimulating the establishment of day care programs in greater proportion (and being less dependent financially on the academic institutions), students also retained managerial authority of the programs to some considerable extent. While all of the laboratory schools and almost all of the nursery schools were administered by academic departments, only one-fourth of the day care programs were so administered. In addition, student-parents administer 48 percent of the campus day care programs. Also, in 30 percent of such programs, student-parents exercise authority for hiring the principal program staff (authority which student-parents do not hold to any considerable extent in laboratory or nursery schools).

For students to assume administrative responsibilities, to face the work-a-day pressures of developing and managing a day care program of safety and quality, is far less exciting and adventurous than negotiating with and harassing university administrators for space and funds. With the apparent waning of the student rebellions on campus, one could expect the day care militants to seek other adventures, leaving the leadership to less passionate but more sober, program- and career-oriented students.[4]

---

3. For a cogent discussion of the student rebellions, see Joseph Bensman and Arthur Vidich, The New American Society (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1971), Chapter 13.

4. The belief that activism is waning may be premature. The Women's Liberation Movement, a major constituent in day care activism, continues to make itself heard. Perhaps the recent remarks of the President of the National Organization for Women, Ms. Wilma Scott Heide, herald future action: "child care may be the gut level issue of the feminist movement." The Spectrum (student newspaper at the State University of New York at Buffalo), January 22, 1973, p.2.

Among other expected consequences of this shift of leadership, may be a greater willingness to comply with university routines, such as adherence to reporting and similar requirements, as well as possibly a diminished reluctance to have the day care programs serve research purposes.

Whether the newly established campus programs will not only live out their infancy but flourish remains to be seen. Perhaps they may be absorbed by the traditional academic departments as student fervor declines. On the other hand, if students continue to struggle with the various responsibilities of managing such programs, they may learn lessons few instructors could teach. Moreover, if that management were to produce fresh programs of quality, as distinctive in early childhood education as some student-run law school journals are in legal education, children and the educators would benefit. Meanwhile, in viewing those campuses where establishment of a day care program remains the only tangible achievement of the "student revolution" one can well imagine a wink from the Owl of Minerva.

LIST OF PROGRAMS

(May, 1971)

(Pre-school programs--day care, nursery school, lab school, other--sponsored by institutions of higher education in the survey sample. Nine respondents asked that their programs not be listed.)

A. In Operation

+ Mr. Joseph W. Maxwell
Child Study Center
Auburn University
Auburn, Alabama 36830

0 Mrs. Kathryn S. Turner
Nursery School Lab
University of Montevallo
Dept. of Home Economics
Montevallo, Alabama 35115

* Mrs. Mattie Gary
Alabama State University Nursery
Alabama State University
Montgomery, Alabama 36101

0 Mrs. Donna Brook Gordon
Montessori School
Tuskegee Institute
Tuskegee Institute, Alabama 36088

* Mrs. Sereetta H. Reed
Russell Nursery School
Tuskegee Institute
Tuskegee Institute, Alabama 36088

0 Dr. Jeraldine Wythycombe
Nursery Program
Northern Arizona University
Flagstaff, Arizona 86001

0 Mrs. May M. Duncan
Pre-Kindergarten Elem. School
Northern Arizona University
Box 5897
Flagstaff, Arizona 86001

Mr. Robert Owens
Student Babysitting Co-op
Kiddie Kollege
College of the Ozarks
Clarksville, Arkansas 72830

Mrs. Rosalyn Scruggs
Day Care Center
Philander Smith College
812 West 13th
Little Rock, Arkansas 72203

* Mrs. J. L. Edwards
A.M. & N. Nursery
Arkansas A.M. & Normal College
Pine Bluff, Arkansas 71601

0 Dr. Mildred Bell
Child Development Nursery School
Harding College
Searcy, Arkansas 72143

Day Care Center
* Nursery School
+ Lab School
0 Other

+ Dr. Houston T. Robison
Child Development Lab
Humboldt State College
Arcata, California 95521

Dr. H. Edward Simmons
Day Care Center
Humboldt State College
Arcata, California 95521

Mrs. Diana Harbour
Child Care Center
Chico State College
Chico, California 95926

+ Mrs. Ruth Swanstrom
Child Development Lab
Chico State College
Chico, California 95926

* Mrs. Elsie S. Wu
Mesa Nursery School
University of California
3999 Miramar Street
La Jolla, California 92037

Mrs. Louise Maddox
Child Care Center
Soroptimist House
California State College
6101 East 7th Street
Long Beach, California 90801

0 Mrs. Ann Watt
The Creative Play School
Johnston College
University of Redlands
East Colton Avenue
Redlands, California 92373

Mr. Eau Herrera
Kids on Kampus
University of Santa Clara
Box 944
Santa Clara, California 93153

* Professor Edith M. Dowley
Bing Nursery School
Stanford University
Stanford, California 94305

Mrs. Susan Newcomer
Children's Center of the
Stanford Community
Stanford University
857 Mayfield
Stanford, California 94305

Mrs. Kathy Morson
Acting Director
Kiddie Campus
University of Colorado
2280 Maine
Boulder, Colorado 80302

+ Mrs. Joanne Mizner, Director
J.F.K. Pre-School
University of Colorado
4200 East Ninth Avenue
Denver, Colorado 80220

0 Mrs. Pina Smith
SCSC Day Nursery
Southern Colorado State College
1802 Sheridan, Bethany Lutheran
Church
Pueblo, Colorado 81003

0 Mrs. Fern Ezell
Mahlen D. Thatcher Child
Care Center
Southern Colorado State College
511 West 14th
Pueblo, Colorado 81003

* Mrs. Gloria M. Gardner
Nursery School
Delaware State College
Dover, Delaware 19901

+ Dr. Elizabeth Sheerer
Child Development Lab
University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia 30601

* Miss Mary E. Venable
Nursery School
Georgia College at Milledgeville
Milledgeville, Georgia 31061

* Mrs. Catherine McDonald
Nursery School
Berry College
Mt. Berry, Georgia 30149

Dr. S. Joseph Gore
On-Campus Day Care Center
Southern Illinois University
Education Division
Edwardsville, Illinois 62025

+ Dr. Queenie B. Mills
Child Development Laboratory
University of Illinois
1105 West Nevada
Urbana, Illinois 61820

* Dale S. Montanelli
Children's Center Nursery School
University of Illinois
Urbana, Illinois 61820

0 Mrs. Judy Kaplan
Cooperative Pre-School
Indiana University
Warthin Apartments
1100 W. Michigan Street
Indianapolis, Indiana 46202

+ Mrs. Florence G. Kerckhoff
Child Development Laboratories
Purdue University
Lafayette Campus
Lafayette, Indiana 47907

* Dr. Harley Lautenschlager
Principal
Pre-kindergarten Program
Indiana State University
7th and Chestnut Streets
Terre Haute, Indiana 47807

Mrs. Gailyn Swomley
Day Care Center
University of Northern Iowa
Cedar Falls, Iowa 50613

* Mrs. Olive Holliday
Home Economics Pre-School
University of Northern Iowa
Cedar Falls, Iowa 50613

+ Dr. Ross Nielsen
Price Lab School
University of Northern Iowa
Cedar Falls, Iowa 50613

Mrs. Opal L. Koontz
Pied Piper Day Care Center
Simpson College
310 West Ashland
Indianola, Iowa 50125

Mrs. Jeanette Wilson
Hawkeye Day Care Center
University of Iowa
419 Hawkeye Court
Iowa City, Iowa 52240

+ Dr. Elizabeth L. Alden
Pre-School Lab
University of Iowa
514 East Hall
Iowa City, Iowa 52240

+ E. R. Bartlett, Principal
Horace Mann Lab School
Kansas State College
Pittsburg, Kansas 66762

Dr. Annette TenElshof
University Cooperative
Pre-School Program
Wichita State University
Wichita, Kansas 67208

0 Mrs. Anna L. Wolfe, Principal
Pilot School
Kentucky State College
Frankfort, Kentucky 40601

0 Dr. Thelma Bell
MSU Laboratory Nursery School
Morehead State University
Morehead, Kentucky 40351

* Dr. Geraldine Hastings
Nursery School
Grambling College
P.O. Box 227
Grambling, Louisiana 71245

* Miss Virginia Langston
Nursery School
Southeastern Louisiana University
Box 863, University Station
Hammond, Louisiana 70401

Dr. Helen B. Harwell
Acadia Day Care Center
Francis T. Nicholls State College
Box 2114
Thibodaux, Louisiana 70301

* Dr. Margaret Jolley
N.S.U. Nursery School
Francis T. Nicholls State College
Thibodaux, Louisiana 70301

* Dr. David Luterman
Thayer Lindsley Pre-School Deaf
Nursery
Emerson College
168 Beacon Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02116

* Mrs. William R. Pounds
Technology Nursery School
Eastgate
60 Wadsworth Street
M.I.T.
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139

Mrs. Erline B. Willis
Tufts Day Care Center
Tufts University
177 College Avenue
Medford, Massachusetts 02155

0 Sister Mary Innocence Kawa
Montessori School
Mercy College of Detroit
8200 West Outer Drive
Detroit, Michigan 48219

Mr. Donald Melcer
Child Care and Family Service.
Michigan State University
Home Mgt. House Unit III
East Lansing, Michigan 48823

+ Mrs. Eileen M. Earhart
Lab Pre-School
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan 48823

0 Mrs. Mariella Aikman
Spartan Nursery School
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan 48823

+ Miss Elizabeth Dickinson
Pre-School Laboratory
Hillsdale College
197 Hillsdale Street
Hillsdale, Michigan 49242

Mrs. Lucille M. Smith
Child Care Center
Oakland University
202 Wilson Hall
Rochester, Michigan 48063

* Mrs. Thelma Court
The Children's Center
Eastern Michigan University
107 Welch Hall
Ypsilanti, Michigan 48197

Mrs. Timothy G. Roufs
Day Care Center
University of Minnesota
1936 Lawn
Duluth, Minnesota 55812

+ Mr. Glenn T. Erickson
Wilson Campus School
Mankato State College
MSC P.O. Box 25
Mankato, Minnesota 56001

+ Mrs. Velma S. Hamilton
Child Development Lab
Delta State College
Cleveland, Mississippi 38732

0 Mrs. Lottie Thornton
Early Childhood Education
Jackson State College
Jackson, Mississippi 39217

* Mrs. Maya Zuck
Washington University Nursery School
Washington University
6908 Millbrook
St. Louis, Missouri 63130

* Dr. Luther L. Gregg III, Principal
Nursery School
Central Missouri State College
Warrensburg, Missouri 64093

+ Mrs. Wilma A. Larson
Child Development Laboratory
Kearney State College
Otto Olsen Building
Kearney, Nebraska 68847

0 Mrs. Virginia Dunn
Head Start Program
Plymouth State College
Speare Building
Plymouth, New Hampshire 03264

0 Mr. E. D. Longenecker
Early Childhood Ed. Program
Trenton State College
Trenton, New Jersey 08625

Associate Professor Albert Vogel
Day Care Center
University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87106

* Miss Carolyn Hill
Nursery School
University of New Mexico
Manzanita Center
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87106

Mrs. Blair Barrett
Day Care Center
State Univ. of N.Y. at Albany
1400 Washington Avenue
Albany, New York 12203

Mrs. Rhoda Jacobs
Brooklyn College Day Care Collective
Brooklyn College
Brooklyn, New York 11210

+ Dr. Clara Loomanitz
Early Childhood Center
Brooklyn College
Brooklyn, New York 11210

+ Sister Margaret Louise Shea
Dillon Child Study Center
St. Joseph's College
245 Clinton Avenue
Brooklyn, New York 11205

0 Mrs. Sonya Bemporad
Early Childhood Center
Sarah Lawrence College
Bronxville, New York 10708

* Mrs. Eleanor Roodenburg
Nursery School Program
State Univ. College at Geneseo
Geneseo, New York 14454

+ Professor Bruce Grossman
Child Development Center
Hofstra University
Hempstead, New York 11550

Miss Candy Seligman
Child Care Center
Hunter College
695 Park Avenue
New York, New York 10028

) Mrs. Dorothy Gross, Director
Sarah Lawrence/Yonkers
Experimental Pre-Kindergarten
Sarah Lawrence College
579 Warburton Avenue
Yonkers, New York 10701

* Miss Mary Brown Allgood
Lucy Brock Nursery School
Appalachian State University
Dept. of Home Economics
Boone, North Carolina 28607

+ Mrs. Charlotte C. Wheeler
Early Childhood Center
Johnson C. Smith University
Charlotte, North Carolina 28216

+ Mrs. Musia Lakin
Pre-School Lab
Duke University
118 Bivens Street
Durham, North Carolina 27707

* Mrs. Paula B. Mack
Nursery-Kindergarten
North Carolina Central University
Durham, North Carolina 27707

+ Mr. Harry Lachey
College of Education Lab School
Ohio University
Athens, Ohio 45701

* Miss Julie Nehls
School of Home Economics
Nursery Program
Ohio University
Athens, Ohio 45701

* Mrs. Charline White
Nursery School
Oklahoma Panhandle State College
Goodwell, Oklahoma 73939

+ Mr. J. Phillip O'Neill
Child Development Laboratory
Oregon State University
Family Life Department
Corvallis, Oregon 97331

* Miss Patricia Bell
Nursery School
Indiana University of Pa.
Ackerman Hall
Indiana, Pennsylvania 15701

+ Mrs. Ann B. Taylor
Children's School
Margaret Morrison Building
Carnegie-Mellon University
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213

Dr. Charles J. Igoe
Migrant Day Care Center
Susquehanna University
Selinsgrove, Pennsylvania 17870

0 Dr. Donald Peters
Early Childhood Education
Pennsylvania State University
S24D Human Development Building
University Park, Pennsylvania 16802

* Mrs. Lily Orlandi de Berrios
Director
Nursery School
University of Puerto Rico
Rio Piedras, Puerto Rico 00931

O Dr. Jay Richardson
Child Development & Family Relations
South Dakota State University
East Men's Hall
Brookings, South Dakota 57006

* Mrs. John B. Clark
TTU Nursery School
Tennessee Technological University
Cookeville, Tennessee 38501

Mrs. Joan Northern
MHB Day Care Center
Mary Hardin-Baylor College
MHB Station
Belton, Texas 76513

* Mrs. Marie B. Tylicke
MHB Nursery School
Mary Hardin-Baylor College
MHB Station
Belton, Texas 76513

* Miss Clara Lloyd
University Nursery School
North Texas State University
Dept. of Home Economics
Denton, Texas 76203

O Dr. Allena Pace
Nursery School Lab
Home Economics Department
Sam Houston State College
Huntsville, Texas 77340

* Dr. Doris Dittmar
White House Kindergarten
School of Education
Sam Houston State College
Huntsville, Texas 77340

+ Mrs. Estelle H. Wallace
Professor
Child Development Center
Texas Tech University
Lubbock, Texas 79409

* Mrs. Doris Brown
Home Economics Nursery School
Southwest Texas State University
San Marcos, Texas 78666

O Professor Bonnie R. Bishop
Nursery School Lab
Southern Utah State College
Cedar City, Utah 84720

* Dr. Jean Kuntz
Weber State College Nursery School
Weber State College
Ogden, Utah 84403

* Dr. Mildred N. Jordan
Gandy Hall Nursery School
Virginia State College
Box M
Petersburg, Virginia 23803

* Mrs. Tordis Busskohl
EWSC Nursery School
Eastern Washington State College
710 Fifth Street
Cheney, Washington 99004

O Mrs. Fran Bovos
Lab Nursery School
Central Washington State College
Ellensburg, Washington 98926

* Mrs. Martha G. Childers
Nursery School
Marshall University
Huntington, West Virginia 25701

O Dr. Raymond Schmelter
Campus School
Wisconsin State University
Oshkosh, Wisconsin 54901

+ Dr. John Pearson
University Laboratory School
Wisconsin State University
Stevens Point, Wisconsin 54481

B. Proposed or Planned

Children's Center
Sacramento State College
6000 J Street
Sacramento, California 95819

Mrs. Julie Levine
Day Care Center
University of Illinois
P.O. Box 6998
Chicago, Illinois 60680

Day Care Center
New Orleans Campus
Louisiana State University
New Orleans, Louisiana 70122

Child Care Program
Duke University
Durham, North Carolina 27706

State University of New York at Buffalo

SCHOOL OF SOCIAL POLICY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES

FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCES AND ADMINISTRATION

Appendix B, No. 1

Original Letter to Office of President

March 17, 1971

Dear

The assistance of your office is requested to facilitate our conduct of a survey of Child Care at Institutions of Higher Education. Interest in this survey has been officially expressed by Mrs. Elizabeth Duncan Koontz, Director, Women's Bureau, U.S. Department of Labor, and by Dr. Edward Zigler, Director, Office of Child Development, U.S. Department of HEW.

The survey is to encompass a sample of colleges and universities throughout the United States. Its purposes are to estimate the number of currently operating child care programs (i.e., day care, nursery school, ...) sponsored by those institutions and to describe these programs. Your institution has been selected in the probability sample. For that reason your assistance in completing the bottom portion of this page is necessary. The survey questionnaire will be sent to the individual(s) you name. Please return by March 25, 1971. A self-addressed, return envelope is enclosed for your convenience. Thank you for your help.

Yours truly,

Bernard Greenblatt

Bernard Greenblatt
Associate Professor

(tear here and return)

PLEASE COMPLETE WHERE APPROPRIATE:

_____
your name and title

We have a:

1. Day Care Center

   Name of Program _____
   Director's Name _____
   Director's Address _____
   _____

2. Nursery School

   Name of Program _____
   Director's Name _____
   Director's Address _____
   _____

3. Lab School

   Name of Program _____
   Director's Name _____
   Director's Address _____
   _____

4. We have none of the above. _____

102 FOSTER HALL, BUFFALO, NEW YORK 14214 TEL. (716) 831-2526

State University of New York at Buffalo

OFFICE OF THE DEAN
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL POLICY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES

FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCES AND ADMINISTRATION

Appendix B, No. 2

First Follow-up to Office of President

March 30, 1971

Dear

Cooperation of your office is again requested regarding a survey of Child Care at Institutions of Higher Education. The survey, about which we wrote to you on March 17, has been officially endorsed by pertinent Federal agencies.

The survey is to encompass a sample of colleges and universities throughout the United States. Its purposes are to estimate the number of currently operating child care programs (i.e., day care, nursery school,...) sponsored by those institutions and to describe those programs. Your institution has been selected in the probability sample. For that reason, your assistance in completing the bottom portion of this page is necessary. The survey questionnaire will be sent to the individual(s) you name. Please return by April 3. A self-addressed, return envelope is enclosed. Finally, if you are interested, we can provide you with the names and addresses of universities or colleges which report having a child care program.

Yours truly,

Bernard Greenblatt

Bernard Greenblatt
Associate Professor

TEAR HERE AND RETURN

PLEASE COMPLETE WHERE APPROPRIATE: _____ your name and title

We have a:

1. Day Care Center
   Name of Program _____
   Director's Name _____
   Director's Address _____
   _____

2. Nursery School
   Name of Program _____
   Director's Name _____
   Director's Address _____
   _____

3. Lab School
   Name of Program _____
   Director's Name _____
   Director's Address _____
   _____

4. We have none of the above _____.

102 FOSTER HALL BUFFALO, NEW YORK 14214 TEL. (716) 831-2526

State University of New York at Buffalo

SCHOOL OF SOCIAL POLICY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES

FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCES AND ADMINISTRATION

Appendix B, No. 3

Second Follow-up to Office of President

April 7, 1971

Dear

The survey of Child Care at Institutions of Higher Education, which we have written about previously, needs your help. Without that help the number of such child care programs in the U.S. cannot be estimated, nor can the programs be described. That information and a list of those programs would also be useful for planning by colleges, universities, and Federal agencies.

Your institution has been selected in the probability sample, so completion of the bottom portion of this page is necessary. You are asked to provide information on currently operating child care programs for pre-school age children sponsored by your institution (i.e., day care, nursery school, lab school,...). The survey questionnaire will be sent to the individual(s) you name. Please return by April 14 in the enclosed return envelope.

Yours truly,

Bernard Greenblatt

Bernard Greenblatt
Associate Professor

Tear Here and Return

PLEASE COMPLETE WHERE APPROPRIATE:

_____
your name and title

We have a:

1. Day Care Center

   Name of Program _____
   Director's Name _____
   Director's Address _____
   _____

2. Nursery School

   Name of Program _____
   Director's Name _____
   Director's Address _____
   _____

3. Lab School

   Name of Program _____
   Director's Name _____
   Director's Address _____
   _____

4. We have none of the above _____

102 FOSTER HALL, BUFFALO, NEW YORK 14214 TEL.(716)831-2526

State University of New York at Buffalo

SCHOOL OF SOCIAL POLICY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES

FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCES AND ADMINISTRATION

Appendix B. No. 4

Original Letter to
Program Director

April 16, 1971

Dear

We are writing to solicit your participation in a survey of Child Care at Institutions of Higher Education. Interest in this national survey has been officially expressed by Mrs. Elizabeth Duncan Koontz, Director, Women's Bureau, U.S. Department of Labor, and by Dr. Edward Zigler, Director, Office of Child Development, U.S. Department of H.E.W.

Your name was obtained via the Office of the President of your university or college.

The survey encompasses a probability sample of colleges and universities throughout the United States. Its purposes are to estimate the number of currently operating child care programs (i.e., day care, nursery school, lab school, ...) sponsored by those institutions and to describe those programs. Your institution has been selected in the sample. For that reason your assistance in completing the enclosed questionnaire is necessary.

Confidentiality will be strictly observed in treating the information you provide on the questionnaire. The name of your program will be included in the list of responding programs only if you give express approval. If you are interested, we can provide you with that listing of universities or colleges which report having child care programs.

Please return the completed questionnaire by April 23. A stamped, self-addressed return envelope is enclosed for your convenience. Thank you for your help.

Yours truly,

Bernard Greenblatt

Bernard Greenblatt
Associate Professor

BG:bjm

Enclosure

102 FOSTER HALL, BUFFALO, NEW YORK 14214 TEL.(716)831-2526

State University of New York at Buffalo

SCHOOL OF SOCIAL POLICY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES

FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCES AND ADMINISTRATION

Appendix B, No. 5

First Follow-up to
Program Director

April 29, 1971

Dear

Your cooperation is earnestly requested on the survey of Child Care at Institutions of Higher Education. We wrote to you earlier this month on the basis of information obtained via the Office of the President of your university or college.

The survey encompasses a probability sample of colleges and universities throughout the United States. It focuses on currently operating programs primarily involving pre-school age children (i.e., day care, nursery school, lab school,...) sponsored by those institutions. Such programs are of interest whether their function mainly concerns providing care and/or education of pre-school age children, or conducting research, or training staff for early childhood care and education. Estimating the number of such programs and describing them are the purposes of the survey.

Your program has been selected in the sample. For that reason, it is urgent that the questionnaire previously sent to you be completed and returned. If a copy of the questionnaire is now needed, please call us collect at (716) 831-5361.

Confidentiality will be strictly observed in treating the information you provide on the questionnaire. The name of your program will be included in the list of responding programs only if you give express approval. If you are interested, we can provide you with that listing of universities or colleges which report having child care programs.

Please complete and return the questionnaire before May 6.

Yours truly,

Bernard Greenblatt

Bernard Greenblatt
Associate Professor

BG:bjm

102 FOSTER HALL BUFFALO, NEW YORK 14214 TEL.(716)831-2526

State University of New York at Buffalo

SCHOOL OF SOCIAL POLICY AND COMMUNITY SERVICES

FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCES AND ADMINISTRATION

Once again your cooperation is requested on the Survey of Child Care at Institutions of Higher Education.

The two letters previously sent in April described the survey scope and goals. Achieving those goals would place the U.S. Office of Child Development (H.E.W.) and the Department of Labor -- which have officially expressed interest in the Survey -- in a better position to consider whether and how to best assist programs for the pre-school age children on university and college campuses.

Instrumental to those aims is your completion of the enclosed questionnaire. Also, by doing so, your program (day care, nursery school, lab school,...) and your university and college could receive public attention by being included in the list of such programs which is to be published.

For these practical reasons, as well as adding to knowledge about such programs, we ask you to complete and return the questionnaire by May 17.

Yours truly,

Bernard Greenblatt

Bernard Greenblatt
Associate Professor

BG:bjm

Enclosures

102 FOSTER HALL BUFFALO, NEW YORK 14214 TEL.(716)831-2526

Appendix B, No. 7

Third Follow-up to

Program Director

WESTERN UNION

RAND BLDG., BUFFALO, N. Y. 14203
TL 4-4500

PERIOD ENDED

June 1971

Bernard Greenblatt
10 Angie St.
Buffalo, N.Y.

PLEASE DETACH AND MAIL THIS STUB WITH YOUR CHECK.
BILLS ARE DUE AND PAYABLE WHEN RENDERED. THANK YOU.

AMOUNT $ 65.25

— C H A R G E S —

To: **Details attached**

Message:

Cooperation is urgently requested on the Survey of Child Care/at Institutions of Higher Education. Receiving completed questionnaires from each/Institution in the sample is vitally important. Federal and other/organizations have expressed great interest in this survey which/will aid them in initiating and planning legislation for pre/school programs. Your program can be included in the list/to be published with the survey report. Research confidentiality is assured. The questionnaire was/sent previously. If another is needed telephone collect to/ 716-831-5361. Thank you.

State University of New York at Buffalo
School of Social Policy and Community Services
Library Circle-Foster Hall
Buffalo, New York 14214

APPENDIX C

SURVEY OF CHILD CARE AT INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Name of University/College_____

(1-4)_____ Name of Child Care Program_____

(5)_____ Address_____

(6)_____ Name of Person Responding_____

(7)_____ Title_____

SECTION I.
Relationship of Child Care Program to the University/College.

(8)_____ 1. Where is the child care program located?

1._____On Campus

2._____Off Campus

(9)_____ 2. Is the physical plant used by the child care program: (check one)

1._____Owned by the University/College

2._____Rented by the University/College

3._____Other (specify)_____

_____

(10)_____ 3. Who was primarily responsible for initiating the program? (check one)

1._____Administration

2._____Students

3._____Faculty

4._____Other (specify)_____

(11)_____ 4. Which unit of the University/College administers the child care program? (check one)

1._____Administration

2._____Home Economics Department

3._____School of Education

4._____Child Development Department

5._____Social Welfare Department

6._____Other (specify)_____

(12)_____ 5a. Does the University/College contribute more than half of the operational funds?

1._____Yes

2._____No

5b. If no, what are the major sources of these funds?

3-8._____

(13)_____ 6. In addition to fees, what are other resources for the program? (check all that apply)

1._____University/College contribution in kind (i.e., space, salaries, etc.)

2._____University/College contribution in cash

3._____Cooperative services from parents

4._____Other (i.e., gifts) please specify_____

_____

(14)_____ 7. Does the University/College carry a fire and/or liability insurance policy on the child care program?

1._____Yes

2._____No

(15)_____ 8. Who hires the Director and/or Head Teacher? (check one)

1._____University/College Administration

2._____Parent Group

3._____Administering Department

4._____Other (specify)_____

9. Is the program used for training students in the following fields? (check "Yes" or "No" for each field)

		Yes	No
(16)_____	Child Development	_____	_____
(17)_____	Psychology	_____	_____
(18)_____	Education	_____	_____
(19)_____	Social Welfare	_____	_____
(20)_____	Nursing	_____	_____
(21)_____	Medicine	_____	_____
(22)_____	Other (specify)_____		

SECTION II.
Child Care Program

(23)_____ 10. When was the child care program established?

_____Year

(24)_____ 11. How many more children can you accommodate with present physical resources and staff? (check one)

1._____No more

2._____1-5

3._____6-10

4._____11-15

5._____16-20

6._____more than 20

12. How many children in each group are currently enrolled in the program? (fill in each category)

(25-27)_____ _____Total number of children enrolled

(28-30)_____ _____Number of children under 1 year

(31-33)_____ _____Number of children age 1 to 2 years

(34-36)_____ _____Number of children age 3 to 5 years

(37)_____ 13a. Do you have a waiting list?

1._____Yes

2._____No

(38-40)_____ 13b. If yes, how many are on the list? Number _____

(41-44)_____ 14. What is the annual operational budget specifically for the child care program? (to the nearest 100 dollars)

$_____

(45)_____ 15. Are rent or capital costs included in the budget figure?

1._____Yes

2._____No

(46-49)_____ 16. What do you estimate is the annual cost per child for the operation of your program?

$_____

(50)_____ 17a. Do you charge fee?

1._____Yes

2._____No

17b. If yes, please attach a copy of the fee scale.

(51-52)_____ 18. If you charge fees, approximately what is the average fee paid? (enter amount above appropriate time period)

(53-54)_____

(55-56)_____

$_____ _____ _____ _____ _____

a. hour b. day c. week d. month e. year

19. How many hours each day is your program in operation? (fill in each day)

	Number of Hours
(57-58)_____ Monday	_____
(59-60)_____ Tuesday	_____
(61-62)_____ Wednesday	_____
(63-64)_____ Thursday	_____
(65-66)_____ Friday	_____

(67)_____ 20. Do any of the children spend four or more hours per day in the program?

1._____Yes

2._____No

21. For the majority of children, what are the average number of daily and weekly hours of care?

(68-69)_ Daily: _____Hours

(70-71)_____ Weekly: _____Hours

(72)_____ 22. How many months per year does the child care program operate?

_____Months/Year

(73)_____ 23. Is your program either licensed or registered? (check one)

1._____Yes, licensed

2._____Yes, registered &R-accredited

3._____Both

4._____Neither

SECTION III.
Children and Parents

(74)_____ 24a. Do you admit children on a first-come-first-serve basis?

1._____Yes

2._____No

(75)_____ 24b. If no, describe (i.e., children of students have first priority, etc.)

_____

25. Of the mothers with children in the program, about how many are in the following occupations? (fill in each category)

(8-9)_____ _____Clerical, secretarial, maintenance staff

(10-11)_____ _____Administrative or professional (includes faculty)

(12-14)_____ _____Students

(15-17)_____ _____Homemakers only

(18-19)_____ _____Other (specify)_____

(20-22)_____ _____Total

(23-25)_____ 26. About how many of the mothers are heads of their families?

_____Mothers

27. About how many of the student-parent users are: (fill in each category)

		Mothers	Fathers
(26-28)_____ (29-31)_____	Full Time Students	____	____
(32-33)_____ (34-35)_____	Part Time Students	____	____

(36)_____ 28. Is your enrollment limited to children of students?

1._____Yes

2._____No

(37)_____ 29a. Do all of the children generally attend each day for the same length of time?

1._____Yes

2._____No

(38)_____ 29b. If no, is the schedule for some children adjusted to the time schedules of individual parents?

1._____Yes

2._____No

(39)_____ 30. Have the hours of operation of the program been set to conform to the academic schedule of students whose children are enrolled?

1._____Yes

2._____No

0._____Not applicable, no children of students

(40)_____ 31. Do you consider the terms "drop-in center" or "baby-sitting" descriptive of your program?

1._____Yes

2._____No

32. Please check meals served. (check all that apply)

(41)_____ _____Breakfast

(42)_____ _____Lunch

(43)_____ _____Dinner

(44)_____ _____None

SECTION IV.
Staff

(45)_____ 33. What is the highest level of education completed by the Director and by the Head Teacher? (check one in each column)

(46)_____

	Director	Head Teacher
Some high school or high school graduate	____	____
Some college or junior college graduate	____	____
Four year college graduate	____	____
Post-graduate	____	____

(47)_____
(48)_____
(49)_____
(50)_____
(51)_____
(52)_____
(53)_____
(54)_____
(55)_____
(56)_____
(57)_____
(58)_____
(59-60)_____
(61-62)_____

34. How many of the child care program staff are in each of the following categories?

	Number of Paid Staff	Number of Unpaid Volunteers
Director	_____	_____
Teacher	_____	_____
Assistant Teacher	_____	_____
teacher aide	_____	_____
Housekeeping	_____	_____
Clerical	_____	_____
Total	_____	_____

35. What is the adult-child ratio in each of the age groups in your program? (fill in where applicable)

Age Group of Children	Adult : Child
(63-64)_____ Under 1 year	_____ : _____
(65-66)_____ 1 to 2 years	_____ : _____
(67-68)_____ 2 to 3 years	_____ : _____
(69-70)_____ 3 to 4 years	_____ : _____
(71-72)_____ 4 to 5 years	_____ : _____

(8)_____
(9)_____
(10)_____
(11)_____
(12)_____
(13)_____
(14)_____
(15)_____
(16)_____
(17)_____
(18)_____
(19)_____
(20-21)_____
(22-23)_____

36. How many of the child care program staff in each category work full time and how many part time?

	Number Full Time	Number Part Time
Director	_____	_____
Teacher	_____	_____
Assistant Teacher	_____	_____
teacher aide	_____	_____
Housekeeping	_____	_____
Clerical	_____	_____
Total	_____	_____

(24)_____

37. May we include your university in a list of institutions responding to our survey?

1. _____Yes
2. _____No

PLEASE USE REVERSE SIDE OF PAGE FOR ANY COMMENTS YOU THINK WE SHOULD HAVE.

SAMPLE PLAN, STRATUM WEIGHTS, AND SAMPLING VARIABILITY

1. Sample Plan

For fiscal reasons a sample size was decided upon of approximately 300 colleges and universities. They were selected as a systematic, random sample from the 1,093 senior, co-educational, accredited colleges and universities in the United States in 1970 (as listed in Information Please Almanac). Preliminary data from the U.S. Department of Labor as well as experience suggested that enrollment size of the institution would have some bearing on the likelihood that a pre-kindergarten program would be present on campus. Accordingly, a sample stratified by enrollment size seemed indicated.[1]

The sizes in each stratum were selected by a procedure which approximated an optimum allocation.[2] More precisely, that allocation aimed at minimizing the variance of the estimated total number of pre-kindergarten programs (or, at maximizing the accuracy of that estimate) for a fixed survey expenditure. That optimum allocation was calculated using the formula

$$\frac{n_h}{N_h} = k\, S_h .$$

Values assumed were: for the total sample size, approximately 300; for the proportion of pre-kindergarten programs on "large" campuses--enrollments of 2,500 or more, 0.10, and on "small" campuses, 0.05. For ease of weighting sample estimates the optimum allocations of 145 and 155 (to large and to small institutions, respectively) were adjusted to 147 and 163 (see Table 1).[3]

---

1. The strata employed were suggested by other data on institutions of higher education. See U.S. Dept. of HEW, Digest of Educational Statistics (Washington, D.C.: U.S. GPO, 1966), Table 101, p. 80; and the Standard Education Almanac, 1970, Figure 23, p. 138.

2. See Leslie Kish, Survey Sampling (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1967), pp. 92ff.

3. For comparison, a proportionate allocation would have led to stratum sizes of 120 and 180, respectively.

Within each stratum a systematic random sample was chosen using a single random start (selected from a table of random numbers); the interval within each stratum was the inverse of the sample fractions (see Table 1).

The survey employed a two-phase process for identifying programs and collecting data (described in detail in Chapter II). In sampling terms the final sample consisted of a combination of stratified and cluster samples.

(Institutions surveyed to identify programs were stratified; some of the programs surveyed for aspects of their operations fell into clusters, that is, where multiple programs operate at an institution that constitutes a cluster.) That sampling combination complicated the calculations and statistical analysis. Thus different formulae had to be employed in estimating the aggregate or total number of programs at academic institutions than were used in estimating characteristics of the programs. These are detailed below. However, to avoid the greater problems of statistical analysis entailed in cluster sampling, the procedures employed for estimating program variables, and their variances, were based on a stratified sample assumption, rather than on cluster sampling.

To compensate for assuming a stratified sample, an arbitrarily selected conservative compensation was made: variances of estimates of program variables were increased by 1.5.[4] In retrospect, ratio estimates might well have been appropriate for the sample plan used in the survey.

2. Stratum Weights

Effective sampling fractions pertaining to program characteristics for each stratum were calculated using the formula:

$$\frac{\#\text{ Institutions in Sample Stratum}}{\#\text{ Institutions in Universe Stratum}} \times \frac{\#\text{ Institutions Responding}}{\#\text{ Institutions in Sample Stratum}} \times \frac{\#\text{ Identified Programs Responding}}{\#\text{ Identified Programs}}$$

4. It is not inconceivable that the variances of program variables calculated on a stratified sample assumption are actually larger, without the arbitrary inflation by 1.5, than would be the variances calculated using cluster sampling formulae: the degree of homogeneity between programs in the same cluster (on the same campus) conceivably may be smaller than the overall degree of homogeneity among all programs in the population. If this conjecture were valid, the standard errors and confidence ranges in this report would be overly conservative estimates of the actual values.

Using the data presented in Tables 1, 2 and 5 the effective sampling fractions (for programs) were calculated for the strata of small and of large colleges and universities ("Small" and "Large" stratum, respectively).
For the small stratum,

$$E.S.F._S = \frac{163}{655} \times \frac{159}{163} \times \frac{26}{27} = .234;$$

for the large stratum,

$$E.S.F._L = \frac{147}{438} \times \frac{143}{147} \times \frac{92}{107} = .281.$$

These fractions were then employed to calculate the respective stratum weights. Using the formula

$$W_S = \frac{E.S.F._L}{E.S.F._S + E.S.F._L} \quad \text{and}$$

$$W_L = \frac{E.S.F._S}{E.S.F._S + E.S.F._L} \quad ;$$

$W_S = .546$ and $W_L = .454$.

These values were employed in weighting characteristics of programs in the strata (for example, percentages of program types and average program enrollment) and their variances, to calculate national estimates, and their confidence ranges. Thus, given a "small" stratum percentage of 19.2 and a "large" stratum percentage of 23.9 (percentages of day care programs, Table 6), the estimated national percentage of that type among campus pre-kindergarten programs =

$$\left[(19.2)\ .546 + (23.9)\ .454 = 21.3.\right]$$

This weighting procedure was employed in calculating national estimates of program variables (for example, weighted percentages, footnoted as such in various tables) and averages. The confidence ranges presented in Table A, below, pertain to the national (or weighted) percentage estimates.

3. Sampling Variability

Since the estimates obtained in this survey are based on a sample, they will differ from the data which would have been obtained from a complete enumeration (of the 1,093 institutions) using the same questionnaire and tabulating procedures. A probability sample having been

employed, standard errors can be calculated. The standard error is a measure of the chance variation which might occur because only a part of the total group was surveyed.

The standard (or sample) error does not take into account other errors which might exist, such as: failure to obtain responses on all items from all respondents, obtaining incorrect or inconsistent responses, errors due to possible ambiguity of a questionnaire item, errors due to faulty recording, or errors in processing the questionnaire data. To be sure, measures for checking the editing, coding, and tabulating work were employed to minimize processing errors.

The confidence range is computed by using the standard error. The 95 percent confidence range means that the chances are 95 out of 100 that an estimate from the sample would differ from the corresponding value obtained from an enumeration (of the 1,093 institutions) by less than twice--actually 1.96 times--the standard error. Or, if we were to repeat the survey, drawing similar samples and calculating the confidence ranges, these confidence ranges would encompass the "true" value 95 times out of 100.

Table A.--Approximate 95% Confidence Range of Estimated Percentage

Estimated percentage	95% confidence range*
10	4.2 - 15.8
20	12.3 - 27.7
30	21.2 - 38.8
40	30.6 - 49.4
50	40.4 - 59.6
60	50.6 - 69.4
70	61.2 - 78.8
80	72.3 - 87.7
90	84.2 - 95.8

*These standard errors were calculated on a simple random sample assumption. A conservative compensation was made by multiplying the simple random sample variance by 1.5.

Table A presents the confidence ranges for general, decile percentage estimates. These ranges may be applied to "total" percentages (weighted to reflect stratum sizes and percentages) for which specific confidence ranges are not reported, as in Table 1, et passim. Due to sampling variability, the chances are 19 in 20 that the "true" value (for the 1,093 institutions in the country) of a sample percentage of, for example, 20 percent would fall between 12.3 and 27.7 percent.

Specific confidence ranges were presented in Chapter III for the national estimates of various program variables. The formulae used in calculating these ranges follow.

The formula used for the standard error of the aggregate number of pre-kindergarten programs at institutions of higher education in the United States is:

$$S.E._X = \sqrt{N_L^2 \frac{\sum(X_{L_i} - \bar{X}_L)^2}{n_L(n_L-1)}(1-f_L) + N_S^2 \frac{\sum(X_{S_i} - \bar{X}_S)^2}{n_S(n_S-1)}(1-f_S)}$$

where $N_L = 438$, $n_L = 147$, $N_S = 655$, $n_S = 163$, $f_L = n_L/N_L$, and $f_S = n_S/N_S$ (see Table 1). Since this estimate pertains to institutions and clustering is not involved, the compensation by 1.5 is not applicable.

The 95 percent confidence range for X--the estimated aggregate of 425 pre-kindergarten programs--is $X \pm 1.96$ S.E.X.

The formula employed for the standard error of a program average (for example, average enrollment) is

$$S.E._{\bar{X}} = \sqrt{\left[W_L^2 \frac{\sum(X_{L_i} - \bar{X}_L)^2}{n_L(n_L-1)}(1-E.S.F._L) + W_S^2 \frac{\sum(X_{S_i} - \bar{X}_S)^2}{n_S(n_S-1)}(1-E.S.F._S)\right] 1.5}$$

where $n_L = 92$ and $n_S = 26$ (less any programs not responding on the specific variable of which the average was calculated). The 95 percent confidence range is $\bar{X} \pm 1.96$ S.E.$_{\bar{X}}$.

The formula used for the standard error of a program percentage (for example, percentages of program types) is

$$S.E._p = \sqrt{\left[W_L^2 \frac{P_L(1-P_L)}{n_L-1}(1-E.S.F._L) + W_S^2 \frac{P_S(1-P_S)}{n_S-1}(1-E.S.F._S) \right]} \quad 1.5$$

The 95 percent confidence range is $P \pm 1.96\ S.E._p$.

LIST OF APPENDIX TABLES

Because of rounding, percentages may not add to totals. "Average" refers to arithmetic mean.

Appendix Table	Title	Page
1	Nursery Schools in the United States, by Auspices, 1951	92
2	Basis for Admission to Pre-K Programs, by Type of Program	93
3	Size of Enrollment in Pre-K Programs, by Type of Program	93
4	Average Number of Hours Per Day for the Majority of Children, by Type of Pre-K Program	94
5	Meals Served, by Type of Pre-K Program	94
6	Average Number of Hours Per Week for the Majority of Children, by Type of Pre-K Program	95
7	Annual Operating Budget of Pre-K Programs, by Inclusion-Exclusion of Rent or Capital Costs	95
8	List of Annual Operating Budgets of Pre-K Programs (Excluding Capital Costs), by Type of Program and Annual Duration of Program	96
9	Annual Operating Budget (Excluding Rent or Capital Costs) of 9-Month Pre-K Programs, by Daily Duration	98
10	Annual Operating Budget (Excluding Rent or Capital Costs) of 10-Month Pre-K Programs, by Daily Duration	98

LIST OF APPENDIX TABLES--Continued

Appendix Table	Title	Page
11	Annual Operating Budget (Excluding Rent or Capital Costs) of 11- to 12-Month Pre-K Programs, by Daily Duration	99
12	Annual Per Capita Cost of Pre-K Programs, by Annual and Daily Duration	99
13	Average Weekly Fee Paid, by Daily Duration of Pre-K Program	100
14	Day Care Programs: Number of Full-Time Staff Members in Each Program Role	100
15	Day Care Programs: Number of Part-Time Staff Members in Each Program Role	101
16	Day Care Programs: Number of Paid Staff Members in Each Program Role	101
17	Day Care Programs: Number of Volunteer Staff Members in Each Program Role	102
18	Nursery School Programs: Number of Full-Time Staff Members in Each Program Role	103
19	Nursery School Programs: Number of Part-Time Staff Members in Each Program Role	103
20	Nursery School Programs: Number of Paid Staff Members in Each Program Role	104

LIST OF APPENDIX TABLES--Continued

Appendix Table	Title	Page
21	Nursery School Programs: Number of Volunteer Staff Members in Each Program Role	104
22	Lab School Programs: Number of Full-Time Staff Members in Each Program Role	105
23	Lab School Programs: Number of Part-Time Staff Members in Each Program Role	105
24	Lab School Programs: Number of Paid Staff Members in Each Program Role	106
25	Other (Combination) Pre-K Programs: Number of Full-Time Staff Members in Each Program Role	107
26	Other (Combination) Pre-K Programs: Number of Part-Time Staff Members in Each Program Role	107
27	Other (Combination) Pre-K Programs: Number of Paid Staff Members in Each Program Role	108
28	Number of Respondents Reporting Child/Adult Ratios: Age Group of Children, by Type of Program	108

Appendix Table 1.--Nursery Schools in the United States, by Auspices, 1951

Auspices	Number
Total	2,039
Parochial school	106
Public school	47
University[1/]	224
Cooperative	262
Proprietary	1,310
Miscellaneous[2/]	90

1/ Includes laboratory schools operated by colleges and other educational institutions.

2/ Includes 72 nursery schools for exceptional children under varied but mainly philanthropic auspices, and 18 under "community" auspices. The latter are difficult to distinguish from "community child care centers." The 1951 "census data" on child care centers are too imcomplete to present.

Source: Clark E. Moustakas and Minnie Perrin Berson, The Nursery School and Child Care Center (New York: Whiteside, Inc., 1955).

Appendix Table 2.--Basis for Admission to Pre-K Programs, by Type of Program (in Percent)

Basis	Total	Type			
		Day care	Nursery school	Lab school	Other
All reporting	100.0% (n=116)	100.0% (n=27)	100.0% (n=37)	100.0% (n=26)	100.0% (n=26)
First-come-first-served	44.8	44.4	45.9	46.2	42.3
Other	55.2	55.6	54.1	53.8	57.7

Appendix Table 3.--Size of Enrollment in Pre-K Programs, by Type of Program (in Percent)

Size of enrollment	Total	Type			
		Day care	Nursery school	Lab school	Other
All reporting	100.0% (n=117)	100.0% (n=26)	100.0% (n=39)	100.0% (n=26)	100.0% (n=26)
Under 20	26.5	23.1	28.2	19.2	34.6
20-39	29.9	23.1	41.0	15.4	34.6
40-69	24.9	38.4	15.4	38.5	11.5
70-99	13.7	7.7	12.8	23.1	11.5
100 and over	5.1	7.7	2.6	3.8	7.7

Appendix Table 4.--Average Number of Hours Per Day for the Majority of Children, by Type of Pre-K Program (in Percent)

Hours per day	Type			
	Day care	Nursery school	Lab school	Other
All reporting	100.0% (n=25)	100.0% (n=37)	100.0% (n=24)	100.0% (n=23)
1 to 2 hours	--	10.8	8.3	8.7
3 hours	28.0	59.5	62.5	47.9
4 hours	28.0	13.5	20.8	21.7
5 hours	16.0	5.4	--	4.3
6 hours	8.0	--	4.2	4.3
7 to 8 hours	20.0	10.8	4.2	8.7
9 to 12 hours	--	--	--	4.3

Appendix Table 5.--Meals Served, by Type of Pre-K Program (in Percent)

Meals served	Type			
	Day care	Nursery school	Lab school	Other
All reporting*	100.0% (n=28)	100.0% (n=39)	100.0% (n=26)	100.0% (n=28)
Breakfast	17.9	2.6	11.5	7.1
Lunch	46.4	30.8	57.7	39.3
Dinner	3.6	5.1	--	3.6
No meals served**	32.1	61.5	30.8	50.0

*Multiple responses.
**Most reported serving snacks.

Appendix Table 6.--Average Number of Hours Per Week for the Majority of Children, by Type of Pre-K Program (in Percent)

Hours per week	Type			
	Day care	Nursery school	Lab school	Other
All reporting	100.0% (n=25)	100.0% (n=37)	100.0% (n=23)	100.0% (n=26)
10 hours or less	8.0	21.6	26.1	38.5
11-15 hours	28.0	51.4	47.8	26.9
16-20 hours	20.0	10.8	17.4	15.4
21-40 hours	44.0	16.2	8.7	15.4
41 hours or more	--	--	--	3.8

Appendix Table 7.--Annual Operating Budget of Pre-K Programs, by Inclusior-Exclusion of Rent or Capital Costs

Annual operating budget	Total	Budget includes rent or capital costs	
		Yes	No
All reporting	84*	25	59
Under $1,000	3	--	3
$1,000 up to 5,000	22	3	19
$5,000 up to 10,000	7	3	4
$10,000 up to 20,000	18	6	12
$20,000 up to 30,000	6	2	4
$30,000 up to 40,000	5	2	3
$40,000 up to 50,000	6	1	5
$50,000 and over	17	8	9

*Excludes 34 respondents not reporting this item.

Appendix Table 8.--List of Annual Operating Budgets of Pre-K Programs (Excluding Capital Costs), by Type of Program and Annual Duration of Program

Type	Annual Duration
Day care	9 months
1.	$100
2.	1,300
3.	10,500
4.	19,600
	11 to 12 months
1.	$12,000
2.	15,000
3.	18,000
4.	25,000
5.	45,500
6.	55,850
7.	80,000
8.	89,800
Nursery schools	9 months
1.	$1,800
2.	2,100
3.	3,000
4.	3,000
5.	3,600
6.	4,500
7.	4,900
8.	5,000
9.	7,000
10.	10,700
11.	12,000
12.	14,000
13.	19,000
14.	35,200
15.	40,100
16.	63,000

Appendix Table 8--Continued

Nursery schools	10 months
1.	$13,000
2.	18,000
3.	25,000
4.	49,200
5.	90,700
	11 to 12 months
1.	$7,000
Lab schools	9 months
1.	$1,890
2.	4,292
3.	5,500
4.	28,800
5.	32,700
6.	47,700
7.	53,000
	10 months
1.	$4,200
	11 to 12 months
1.	$26,400
2.	57,700
3.	90,000
Other	9 months
1.	$1,000
2.	2,000
3.	2,100
4.	17,000
5.	39,000
6.	44,600
	10 months
1.	$1,850
2.	2,500
3.	3,500
4.	237,500
	11 to 12 months
1.	$7,560

Appendix Table 9.--Annual Operating Budget
(Excluding Rent or Capital Costs)
of 9-Month Pre-K Programs,
by Daily Duration

Annual operating budget	Daily duration		
	Full-day	Half-day	2 half-days
All reporting	12	18	4
Under $3,000	3	4	-
$3,000 to 9,999	4	5	-
$10,000 to 29,999	5	3	1
$30,000 and over	-	6	3

Appendix Table 10.--Annual Operating Budget
(Excluding Rent or Capital Costs)
of 10-Month Pre-K Programs,
by Daily Duration

Annual operating budget	Daily duration		
	Full-day	Half-day	2 half-days
All reporting	2	3	4
Under $3,000	1	1	-
$3,000 to 9,999	1	1	-
$10,000 to 29,999	-	1	1
$30,000 and over	-	-	3

Appendix Table 11.--Annual Operating Budget (Excluding Rent or Capital Costs) of 11- to 12-Month Pre-K Programs, by Daily Duration

Annual operating budget	Daily duration		
	Full-day	Half-day	2 half-days
All reporting	9	1	3
Under $3,000	-	-	-
$3,000 to 9,999	1	-	1
$10,000 to 29,999	4	1	-
$30,000 and over	4	-	2

Appendix Table 12.--Annual Per Capita Cost of Pre-K Programs,* by Annual and Daily Duration

Annual duration & cost	Daily duration			
	Full-day	Half-day	2 half-days	Other
All reporting	18	17	9	4
9 months:				
under $1,000	9	13	2	1
$1,000 to 2,999	-	2	1	-
10 months:				
under $1,000	2	-	2	1
$1,000 to 2,999	-	-	2	1
11 to 12 months:				
under $1,000	4	2	2	1
$1,000 to 2,999	3	-	-	0

*n=48.

Appendix Table 13.--Average Weekly Fee Paid, by Daily Duration of Pre-K Program (in Percent)

Weekly fee	Daily duration			
	Full-day	Half-day	2 half-days	Other
All reporting*	100.0% (n=37)	100.0% (n=30)	100.0% (n=16)	100.0% (n=4)
Under $5.00	27.0	46.6	43.8	25.0
$5.00 to 9.99	40.5	40.0	31.3	50.0
$10.00 and over	32.4	13.3	25.0	25.0

*28 report not charging fees.

Appendix Table 14.--Day Care Programs: Number of Full-Time Staff Members in Each Program Role

No. of full-time staff	Program role					
	Director	Teacher	Asst. teacher	Teacher aide	House-keeper	Clerk
1	18	8	2	2	1	2
2	2	2	1	-	1	-
3	-	-	2	1	-	-
4 or more	-	1	-	-	-	1

Appendix Table 15.--Day Care Programs: Number of Part-Time Staff Members in Each Program Role

No. of part-time staff*	Program role					
	Director	Teacher	Asst. teacher	Teacher aide	House-keeper	Clerk
1-4	5	4	5	8	8	9
5-9	-	2	2	3	-	1
10-14	-	-	-	-	-	-
15-19	-	-	-	1	-	-
20 or more	-	1	1	1	-	-

*Includes student-teachers and parents performing cooperative services.

Appendix Table 16.--Day Care Programs: Number of Paid Staff Members in Each Program Role

No. of paid staff*	Program role					
	Director	Teacher	Asst. teacher	Teacher aide	House-keeper	Clerk
1	20	11	1	1	4	8
2	2	1	4	3	4	2
3	-	-	2	2	-	-
4 or more	-	5	1	3	-	-
Number unspecified	-	1	1	-	-	-

*Includes work-study personnel.

Appendix Table 17.--Day Care Programs:
Number of Volunteer Staff Members
in Each Program Role

No. of volunteer staff*	Program role					
	Director	Teacher	Asst. teacher	Teacher aide	House-keeper	Clerk
1-4	2	1	3	5	3	3
5-9	-	-	-	3	-	1
10-14	-	-	-	-	-	-
15-19	-	-	1	2	-	-
20 or more	-	-	-	4	1	-
Number unspecified	-	-	-	3	1	1

*Includes student-teachers and parents performing cooperative services.

Appendix Table 18.--Nursery School Programs: Number of Full-Time Staff Members in Each Program Role

No. of full-time staff	Program role					
	Director	Teacher	Asst. teacher	Teacher aide	House-keeper	Clerk
1	22	12	6	-	6	5
2	-	9	2	-	1	1
3	-	-	-	-	-	-
4 or more	-	4	2	1	-	-

Appendix Table 19.--Nursery School Programs: Number of Part-Time Staff Members in Each Program Role

No. of part-time staff*	Program role					
	Director	Teacher	Asst. teacher	Teacher aide	House-keeper	Clerk
1-4	9	7	8	5	13	9
5-9	-	-	2	4	-	-
10-14	-	-	-	3	-	-
15-19	-	-	-	2	-	-
20 or more	-	-	-	1	-	-

*Includes student-teachers and parents performing cooperative services.

Appendix Table 20.--Nursery School Programs: Number of Paid Staff Members in Each Program Role

No. of paid staff*	Program role					
	Director	Teacher	Asst. teacher	Teacher aide	House-keeper	Clerk
1	30	13	8	1	13	12
2	1	7	4	-	5	1
3	-	-	-	2	-	-
4 or more	-	7	2	7	1	-

*Includes work-study personnel.

Appendix Table 21.--Nursery School Programs: Number of Volunteer Staff Members in Each Program Role

No. of volunteer staff*	Program role					
	Director	Teacher	Asst. teacher	Teacher aide	House-keeper	Clerk
1-4	-	2	4	4	1	1
5-9	-	-	-	1	-	-
10-14	-	1	1	2	-	-
15-19	-	-	-	2	-	-
20 or more	-	-	1	1	-	-
Number unspecified	-	-	-	2	-	-

*Includes student-teachers and parents performing cooperative services.

Appendix Table 22.--Lab School Programs: Number of Full-Time Staff Members in Each Program Role

No. of full-time staff	Program role					
	Director	Teacher	Asst. teacher	Teacher aide	House-keeper	Clerk
1	14	7	3	-	5	8
2	1	3	1	-	2	1
3	-	-	-	1	-	-
4 or more	-	6	1	2	-	-

Appendix Table 23.--Lab School Programs: Number of Part-Time Staff Members in Each Program Role

No. of part-time staff*	Program role					
	Director	Teacher	Asst. teacher	Teacher aide	House-keeper	Clerk
1-4	7	8	6	6	7	3
5-9	-	1	4	2	-	-
10-14	-	-	-	-	-	-
15 or more	-	-	-	2	-	-

*Includes student-teachers and parents performing cooperative services.

Appendix Table 24.--Lab School Programs: Number of Paid Staff Members in Each Program Role

No. of paid staff*	Program role					
	Director	Teacher	Asst. teacher	Teacher aide	House-keeper	Clerk
1	19	8	8	2	6	9
2	3	1	1	1	4	1
3	1	4	1	4	-	-
4 or more	-	8	5	4	2	-
Number unspecified	1	1	1	-	-	1

*Includes work-study personnel.

Appendix Table 25.--Other (Combination) Pre-K Programs: Number of Full-Time Staff Members in Each Program Role

No. of full-time staff	Program role					
	Director	Teacher	Asst. teacher	Teacher aide	House-keeper	Clerk
1	13	4	1	1	5	5
2	1	3	2	1	1	-
3	-	1	1	-	-	-
4 or more	-	2	-	2	-	-

Appendix Table 26.--Other (Combination) Pre-K Programs: Number of Part-Time Staff Members in Each Program Role

No. of part-time staff*	Program role					
	Director	Teacher	Asst. teacher	Teacher aide	House-keeper	Clerk
1-4	10	8	8	7	7	9
5-9	-	1	1	2	-	-
10-14	-	-	-	-	-	-
15-19	-	-	-	2	-	-
20 or more	-	-	-	3	-	-

*Includes student-teachers and parents performing cooperative services.

Appendix Table 27.--Other (Combination) Pre-K Programs: Number of Paid Staff Members in Each Program Role

No. of paid staff*	Program role					
	Director	Teacher	Asst. teacher	Teacher aide	House-keeper	Clerk
1	22	5	4	2	7	9
2	-	5	2	3	3	2
3	1	3	2	1	1	-
4 or more	-	4	1	4	1	-
Number unspecified	-	-	-	1	-	-

*Includes work-study personnel.

Appendix Table 28.--Number of Respondents Reporting Child/Adult Ratios:* Age Group of Children, by Type of Program

Age group of children	Type			
	Day care	Nursery school	Lab school	Other
Infants	3	-	2	-
1-year-olds	8	2	1	-
2-year-olds	9	2	6	3
3-year-olds	15	24	16	10
4-year-olds	14	25	21	13

*See Table 46.

* U. S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE : 1973 O - 543-757 (15)